Vol. LIV. No. 3 March, 1916

BX
801
E17
v.54
no.3-6

The Ecclesiastical Review

hly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

THE YOUNG PRIEST AND HIS ELDERS 257
The Rev. WILLIAM J. KERBY, S.T.L., Ph.D., Catholic University of America.
CATHOLICITY IN MODERN RUMANIA 272
The Rev. P. J. SANDALGI, Curtis Bay, Maryland.
THE WAY OF THE CROSS. A Summary of the Legislation of the Church on the Stations of the Cross 281
The Rev. FR. STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., Paterson, New Jersey.
MIRACLES AND MODERN THOUGHT 292
The Very Rev. HUMPHREY MOYNIHAN, S.T.D., College of St. Thomas, St. Paul. Minn.
SOME COUNTRY PARISHES. 303
VIATOR.
THE MORAL SIDE OF THE BOLLINGER BABY CASE 315
The Right Rev. JOHN P. CARROLL, D.D., Bishop of Helena.
THE CATHOLIC POPULATION AND THE CATHOLIC DIRECTORY 320
X. Y. Z.
SUPPORT OF POOR DIOCESAN MISSIONS 324
PASTOR RUSTICUS, Pittsburgh, Pa.
PROPRIETY IN THE USE OF WORDS ONCE AGAIN 325
The Right Rev. ALEXANDER MacDONALD, D.D., Bishop of Victoria.
A CATHOLIC LAWYER'S PLEA TOUCHING THE QUESTION OF PROHIBITION 326
W. T. DRURY, Attorney-at-Law, Morganfield, Kentucky.
THE FALLEN PRIEST 330
VINCENT.
"THAT DAY" 332
J. F. S.
A MARRIAGE CASE 335
The Rev. JOSEPH MacCARTHY, B.C., B.D.L., New York City.
CATHOLIC BOOKS ON PHILOSOPHY 338
SEMI-PUBLIC ORATORIES AND THE OBLIGATION OF HEARING MASS 339
OBLIGATIONS ARISING FROM PRIVATE BETROTHAL 344
RECENT BIBLE STUDY: A Harvard Christology 348
The Rev. WALTER DRUM, S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland.

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
1305 Arch Street THE DOLPHIN PRESS Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1916: American Ecclesiastical Review—The Dolphin Press

Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $3.50; Foreign, 15 shillings ($3.65)
London, England: R. & T. Washbourne, 4 Paternoster Row Melbourne Australia: W. P. Linehan, 309 Little Collins St.
Entered 5 June, 1889, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879.

St. Bernard's Seminary

O-Neh-Da Vineyard

Altar Wine

IN suggesting to the clergy the wisdom of **placing orders for Altar Wine in the early autumn** the managers of the Seminary Vineyard beg to call attention to the reliability of the wine and to its superior qualities.

The grapes are pressed and **the wine is made and cared for under the personal supervision of the Right Reverend Thomas F. Hickey, Bishop of Rochester, who gives his guarantee to the purity of the wine.**

It is both licit and valid matter for the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

No Dealer has this wine for sale.

GRADES AND PRICES

Ordinary Altar Wine, made from Concord, Catawba and Wo den grapes,
Bottled, 5 gallons in 25 bottles ..... $ 6.00
In bulk, 1 keg 10 gallons. 10.00
In bulk, 1 keg 23 gallons. 20.00
In bulk, 1 barrel 46 gallons 40.00

Elvira Altar Wine, made exclusively from the Elvira grape, sold only in bottles,
5 gallons in 25 bottles 9.00

Superior Altar Wine, made exclusively from Delaware, Brighton or Salem grape, sold only in bottles,
5 gallons in 25 bottles 16.00

War Tax Additional.

Kindly advise method of transportation—Freight or express.

Address all communications to REV. M. J. NOLAN, Chancellor, 72 Frank Street, Rochester, N. Y.

ALTAR WINES BEYOND DOUBT

L'Admirable $6.25 per dozen

Novitiate $5.00 per dozen

Malvoisie $4.00 per dozen

Villa Joseph $4.00 per dozen

War Tax Additional

(COPY)

SACRED HEART NOVITIATE
Los Gatos, Cal., January 3rd, 1916.

THE BARNSTON TEA COMPANY, 6 Barclay Street, New York City.

Gentlemen: It is with pleasure that, looking over our books, we observe that during the year 1915, we have shipped you in sealed cars, the following quantities of our altar wines:

13,252	Gallons	Sweet Novitiate
6,012½	Gallons	Villa Joseph
3,843	Gallons	Malvoisie
103	Gallons	L'Admirable

We take the present opportunity to thank you for your conscientious and painstaking efforts made in handling our wines, the results of which are so gratifying.

For the coming year we have the greatest hopes; we have in our wineries an abundance of excellent wines, made by our own brothers and whose absolute purity we can therefore guarantee. Should your requirements for the coming year double or triple those of last year, we are confident that we can meet them.

Thanking you once more for your efforts made in selling our wines, and wishing you every success during the ensuing year, we desire to remain,

Yours very sincerely, THE SACRED HEART NOVITIATE,

John P. Madden, S.J.

Treasurer

Sole Eastern Agents

Barnston Tea Company, 6 Barclay St., New York, N. Y.

MR. J. W. DONNELLY.

The Donnelly Brothers

Established 1870

Valid and Licit ... Altar Wines

Our wines are popular because of their proven purity and agreeableness for use when fasting

Collegiate . . . . . Mellow and fruity
Jurancon . . . . . Delicate and delicious
Vin de Tours . . . Generous and full-bodied

A trial order solicited. Satisfaction guaranteed.
Please address

The Donnelly Brothers TROY N. Y.

CONTENTS CONTINUED

ANALECTA:

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV:

Quaedam ad SS. Cor Iesu Oratio Indulgentia ditatur 311

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM:

Decretum circa Preces in fine Missae recitandas 312

SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA:

Facultates Confessariorum in Locis Territorii Bellici 313

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII (Sectio de Indulgentiis):

Pium Exercitium XV Feriarum Tertiarum in honorem S. Dominici Conf. quocumque anni tempore peragi potest 313

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month 315

The Moral Side of the Bollinger Baby Case. (*The Right Rev. John P. Carroll, D D., Bishop of Helena, Montana*) 315

The Catholic Population and the "Catholic Directory". (*X. Y. Z.*) 320

Support of Poor Diocesan Missions. (*Pastor Rusticus, Pittsburgh, Pa.*) 324

Propriety in the Use of Words Once Again. (*The Right Rev. Alexander MacDonald, D D., Bishop of Victoria*) 325

A Catholic Lawyer's Plea touching the Question of Prohibition in the United States. (*W. T. Drury, Morganfield, Kentucky*) 326

The Fallen Priest. (*Vincent*) 330

"That Day". (*J.F.S.*) 332

A Marriage Case. (*The Rev. Joseph MacCarthy, B.C., B.D.L., New York City*) 335

When the First Friday is Good Friday 337

Catholic Books on Philosophy 338

Visiting Priests and the Confessions of Nuns 339

Semi-Public Oratories and the Obligation of Hearing Mass 339

Baptism of Protestant Minors without Parents' Consent 341

Intention Requisite for Reception of Baptism 342

The Nuptial Blessing 343

Obligations arising from Private Betrothal 344

Server at Mass 346

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Bible Study: A Harvard Christology. (*The Rev. Walter Drum, S.J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Maryland.*) 348

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Maguire: Is Schism Lawful? 359

Williams: The New Pelagianism 359

Barrett: Strength of Will 362

Williams: Grundfragen der Philosophie und Paedagogik 363

Willems: Institutiones Philosophicae 363

Wibbelt: The Blessed Peace of Death 366

Laveille—Lindsay: The Life of Father De Smet, S.J. (1801—1873) 367

Campbell: Pioneer Laymen of North America. Vol. II 369

Pine: John Bannister Tabb, the Priest-Poet 370

Burgess: The Reconciliation of Government with Liberty 372

Butin: Progressive Lessons in Hebrew with Exercises and Vocabulary 374

Butin: Key to the Progressive Lessons in Hebrew 374

Leslie-Collins-Flood: The Armagh Hymnal 376

Kyriale, seu Ordinarium Missae 379

LITERARY CHAT 380

BOOKS RECEIVED 383

SINCE the publication of the INDEX covering the first fifty volumes of the REVIEW, many subscribers have written us for back copies to help complete their sets. Everything is being done to procure these needed numbers for our correspondents. On this page there is a list of the copies which are asked for, and which we are willing to purchase. Subscribers who are looking for copies other than those listed below would do well to write for them without delay. Inquiries regarding back numbers are coming to this office in greater and greater frequency. It is evident that the INDEX has awakened new interest in the binding of the volumes of the REVIEW, and we shall be glad to hear from those who are trying to complete their volumes, or from those who can supply the following:

COPIES WANTED!

Ecclesiastical Review

1889—February, March, May, June, July, August, September, October, November-December.
1890—All but July, August and September.
1891—Any or all numbers of this year.
1892—All but January, August, September, October and November.
1893—July, August and September.
1894—January, February, March and May.
1895—Any or all numbers of this year.
1896—March, April, May and June.
1897—January.
1900—July.
1904—December.
1905—January, March, and August.
1915—January, February, October and November.
Vols. I to VII and IX, XIV (both inclusive) will also be purchased.

Two complete sets of REVIEW have been placed in our hands, to be sold to settle estates. Correspondence invited.

We can supply many back numbers.
INDEX to first fifty volumes $3.00.

BX
801
.E17
v.54

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SIXTH SERIES.—VOL. IV.—(LIV).—MARCH, 1916.—No. 3.

THE YOUNG PRIEST AND HIS ELDERS.

MUCH of the wisdom and happiness of a priest depends on his attitude toward fellow-priests. The priesthood constitutes a class apart in our Catholic life. "Elevation is separation." Not all of the rich and wonderful experience that a priest enjoys as adviser and friend in every kind of situation and with every type of life prevents him from feeling more or less apart from the people. Nor does it hinder the people from feeling their separateness from him. He is set apart for the service of the sanctuary. The normal stream of confidences or play of association is within the priesthood itself. Here and there the space that separates clergy from laity is bridged by circumstance, but the whole drift of the clerical life receives its character and approved direction within the priesthood, just as the spontaneous expressions of the life of the laity occur normally in their own circles.

No priest enhances his prestige or increases his effectiveness by laying aside his distinctive point of view and merging into the laity as almost one of them. The people ask that we be men of understanding heart, of sympathy, and resourcefulness; that we be leaders; that we be just, prudent, tactful, of easy approach, and of gentlemanly instinct always. But they do not ask and they do not welcome the surrender of our distinctive consciousness, the forfeiture of our priestly reserve or the cheapening of that dignity with which we should adorn our office. The deeper instinct of the laity offers to us a more exacting habit of reserve, rule of speech and action than any diocesan synod would attempt. If the priest who is inclined

to find fault with the traditional reserves of his office or to think it manly to lay them aside, would bring an open mind to the analysis of Catholic instinct, he would discover in the Catholic heart, as part of its reverence and trust, an insistent longing to see him sustain the reserves that have made the priesthood honorable.

The companionships and associations of a priest are determined in simple and natural ways. Sometimes class bonds formed in the seminary endure and attachments growing out of them survive the test of years and ripen into comforting and helpful experiences. To a great extent, friendships fall within the limits of the clergy of the diocese. Within the diocese, temperament and like-mindedness play a rôle in determining companionship. Clerical friends "drop in" for dinner or an evening chat. On the whole, the amount of time given by the average priest to companionship or association with other priests is extremely limited. The average pastor in a large city is held to almost uninterrupted attention to the thousand details of parish management and spiritual direction of the congregation. Problems of finance, intricacies of school management, meetings of parish associations, wider activities growing out of parish relations, constant visits from members of the parish who need advice, and search for those that are going astray, consume much of the time and energy of a faithful priest. Thus it happens that he is driven to take attitudes toward his fellow-priests instead of enjoying extended association and leisure with them.

Chance meetings at retreats or conferences, at funerals or Church feasts, are, after all, but chance meetings. They are hurried. They offer opportunity for nothing but superficial contact and exchange of the ordinary courtesies of life. The number of leisure hours available to the average city priest during which he can sit with his friend in refreshing quiet and express his soul in reminiscence, in the interpretation of the drift of things, in comment on literature or the bearings of larger events that affect the Christian philosophy of life, is almost negligible. But at all times, it is possible for the busy priest to have communion with himself, to have an undisturbed quiet hour when he "loafs and invites his soul". In times like these, he has opportunity to reflect upon the impres-

sions that he has formed concerning his fellow-priests. Only in times of such quiet self-examination shall we discover the mistakes that we make in false impressions concerning fellow-priests and the wisdom that we display in accurate impressions concerning them. One of the most important questions suggested by these thoughts relates to the reciprocal attitudes found among young priests and their elders. Each tends to develop a traditional attitude toward the other. Each is more influenced by his impressions of the other than by his actual experience. There are young priests. There are typical young priests. There are elderly priests. There are typical elderly priests. The attitude of each toward the other is of fundamental importance because a right attitude means brotherly union, mutual helpfulness, and joy, while a mistaken attitude leads to estrangement, false judgment, and even unhappiness. Since, therefore, the priest's life is lived largely within priestly circles and since here he has experience of companionship with impressions of priests more regularly than with priests themselves, we are held to greatest care in watching our impressions of one another and in holding firmly to the standards of common sense and charity in the attitudes that we take. This will be shown by a review of the relations that are to be found between the young priest and his elders.

I.

We classify one another by age. We speak of the young, the middle-aged, and the old. Scientists prefer to classify us nowadays by mental conditions and processes rather than by years. When we speak of a young priest, we have in mind not alone the years of youth, but also outlook on life, impulses that are active, illusions that are revered, standards that are cherished, valuations that are accepted, the quality of zeal that is looked upon as duty, and the rule of sacrifice that is accepted as law. When we speak of an elderly priest, we have in mind the impulses that experience has chilled into slumber, no less than those which survive; the illusions that have been forfeited to the exactions of time and those that have taken their place; practical attitudes toward ideals, practical understanding of what is possible and what is impossible, of what is worth doing and of what is not worth doing; settled judg-

ment of the serious joys of life and rejection of the lesser joys that betray the young; in a word, all of those opinions and standards that have survived the onslaught of years and have become the settled axioms of practical wisdom governing our final attitudes toward life.

Practically all elderly priests take a certain attitude toward young priests that may be expressed in terms more or less like those just stated. Young priests have an analogous attitude toward their elders which may be expressed in the same way. The elderly priest expects the average young priest to act according to this impression. The latter expects the elderly priest to act true to it. Thus each is inclined to judge the other through an attitude already taken. He does not hold the attitude subject to knowledge and judgment of the single priest. Now, a right attitude in either toward the other will bring much happiness, much joyful association and reenforcing spiritual experience. A mistaken attitude in either toward the other will color outlook, mislead emotions, disturb the sense of accurate human values, and destroy that refined spiritual association which knows no reserve except that of prudence and no caution except that of reverent love. A wise observer has said that the best proof of the wisdom of an elderly man is found in his attitude toward younger men. When the former has reverence for youth and interest in its visions, he triumphs over the cynical ravages of time and gives proof of a wholesome attitude toward life. The process that intervenes to change the alert zeal of the young priest into the moderated enthusiasm and sober emotion that we shall find in him thirty years later, offers a key to the interior history of the priesthood. The process repeats itself with unfailing regularity. A fair observer may predict with some exactness the way in which seventy out of every hundred young priests will develop in thirty years.

II.

The young priest who comes from the seminary to take his place in the vineyard of the Lord, represents the average product of the action of the seminary on the receptive temperament of a man called to the priesthood. The seminarian placed himself under the play of spiritual, intellectual, and

social influences which tested and chastened his ambitions, rearranged his valuations, reconstructed his outlook, and equipped him with the beginnings of habits which are to be the citadel of his soul in his warfare with evil. The seminarian learned systematic forms of prayer and self-examination. He was put in touch with the traditions of the spiritual life, with the principles and authorities that are held in reverent esteem. Effort was made to awaken spiritual longings which are intended to be the foundations of character, the sources of piety and insight into the spiritual realities that are the alphabet of priestly life. The silver jubilee of the young priest's ordination will show that many changes have occurred. The guidance of dreams will be replaced by the maxims of experience. The enthusiasms of youth will be checked by the caution of age. The intense personal attitudes of untried zeal will yield place to the routine views of a busy man. Nothing seemed impossible to the young priest on the day of his ordination. Much will seem impossible on the day of his silver jubilee. The thoroughness of personal piety and sureness of devotion to great ideals will have been subjected to the acid tests of life, work, and liberty. Much will have been surrendered and much will have been acquired during the intervening years. What is the type of young priest as he begins his work? What is the type of elderly priest when much of his work is done? What is the attitude of each toward the other?

The young priest has an undimmed and inspiring vision of souls. He sees the world peopled with souls. His spiritual impulses are alert. A sweet inner compulsion sustains them in their eagerness to seek out and minister to souls and win for them the enriching grace of God. The reality of the spiritual forces of life masters imagination. Doctrines are convictions quivering with life, drawn from the remotest fastnesses of the heart. The seminary aims at this result. Everything in its routine proclaims the soul, the supremacy of the moral interests of life, the all-searching presence of the spirit of God, the reality of the spiritual forces of the world. Sensitiveness to moral and spiritual duties should be the outcome of this seminary process. Adverse influences are shut out as far as they can be shut out and the work of transforming man

into priest, student into apostle, youth into sage, continues, helped only or hindered only by the deliberate choice of the seminarian himself. There is something that falls just short of ecstacy in the vision that greets the purified eye of a newly consecrated priest. He is vividly conscious of the sacredness of his office, of the sanctions of his power, of moral peril to souls, and of his divine commission to protect them. He sees grace as a vital force, the sacraments as the comforting symbols of the redeeming work of God, sin as the one catastrophe of the universe, virtue as the supreme conditioning interest of life. This vision is serene, certain, over-mastering. The young priest is unhampered by the tyrannies that will later obscure it. Imagination is not yet dulled by experience. Effort is not yet hampered by routine; zeal has not yet been made cynical through doubt. He is protected by the splendid illusions concerning human nature which are always found in noble young men. He has not yet discovered how rebellious human nature may be, how subtle in evil, how discouraging in weakness, how flippant in sin, how reckless in sinning. It is indeed refreshing for those of us who have ceased to take an interest in the vanishing memories of our own youthful visions to discover in the young priest an exhilarating revelation of the way in which we once felt and hoped, and loved our high ideals.

The young priest takes his knowledge from books and dreams, not from life and experience. He brings with him into the priesthood a fondness for books, familiarity with them, and a considerable range of positive information that shows itself in his tastes and conversation. He is technically exact with the rubrics, scrupulously careful in administering the sacraments and precise with every formula. He does not yet know his own limitations nor the protection that he should derive from them. He does not recognize the elusiveness of evil, the rebellious independence of the human heart or the subtle forces that will neutralize his gentlest ministrations. The fine enthusiasms of youth and its freedom from bitterness or impulsive discouragement are prolific sources of hope and effort. The young priest has, as the scientists say, a "low glow point"; that is, it requires but little to stir interest into fiery enthusiasm or the sense of duty into restless zeal for souls. When he is protected by humility, moderated by pru-

dence, and gifted with a docile heart, he offers us the fairest picture vouchsafed to man of the blended mastery of nature and grace in human life.

Our younger colleague pays the cost of his privileges. He is easily discouraged. Disappointment merges quickly into resentment. He is slow to recognize any kind of wisdom except that which is contained in his class-room formulae. The young priest is slow to discover that routine is inevitable, that system is necessary, and that his intensely personal attitude toward spiritual duties must surrender to the limitations of both. He drifts easily into a critical attitude toward his elder colleagues because he judges them by his own wisdom and not by theirs. He is greatly influenced by ideas, principles and theory, and he lacks the practical gift of adapting these to the inevitable limitations of life. He underrates the practical wisdom of his elders because it is a kind of wisdom that he himself does not possess. When he fails to recognize the limitations of his own type and the sure resources of the elderly priest, he ceases to find inspiration in the wisdom or guidance in the practical judgment of the latter. There is always danger that a young priest will adopt disparaging judgment of elder priests as a whole, taking on an air of offensive superiority that little becomes any young man. When this occurs, he becomes intolerant because of inexperience and zeal, always a dangerous combination. By expecting too much of the only kind of bookish perfection that he knows, the young priest unfits himself to find any kind of practical working perfection which the elderly priest may have achieved. It is strange indeed that some young priests fail to understand how much charm a docile spirit and a sense of situation can impart to life. The young always judge their elders severely.

Early in his career the young priest is exposed to the operation of forces that begin to transform him into the more practical man. Countless duties take up his time. He lives less and less with books, more and more among the people. The noble illusions that fed his enthusiasm begin to dissipate themselves when he finds how successfully evil can resist him, how frequently he will be deceived, and how often he will find no compensation but ingratitude for his devotion. Step by step the change goes on. Zeal is chilled by failures. Routine com-

mences to rob his soul of the resiliency that once constituted its promise and its charm. Ideals grow dim, and habits of personal piety are endangered. The intensely personal attitudes toward work tend to become attitudes dictated by routine and system. Some deceitful success in preaching without preparation may lead the young priest to believe that his abilities enable him to dispense with labor in preparing sermons. He becomes a busy priest among busy priests. He adapts himself to his environment. He gradually surrenders his personal preferences and his cherished tastes to take on those of the atmosphere in which he lives. At this point, the challenge to piety and common sense becomes supreme. Difficulties will result from the sometimes good-humored and sometimes ill-humored comment that elderly priests make on the enthusiasms, the manners, and the standards of youth. With the process of change well begun in a manner something like this, we may leave our younger colleague at this point and seek him out on his silver jubilee.

The first discovery that we make in the life of an elderly priest is that it is entirely systematized. He lives by routine. He has more duties than time, more good will than energy, more activities than resources. Hope in the young priest bends life to his ideas. Experience in the elderly priest subjects his ideas to life. Longing for mastery over life makes way for the patient wisdom of surrender to the limitations of life. The experience of the elderly priest in dealing with the complexities of spiritual leadership compels him to take a stand toward all duties that represents his best judgment in reconciling irreconcilables. He is so harried by claims on time and energy that the experience of no one seems to aid him much. He must work out his own problems in his own way. In doing so, he makes his surrenders and determines on the surviving reverences that furnish inspiration to his spirit and standards to his judgment.

The heart of the elderly priest has known the worries of finance and the subtleties of evil as they endanger young and old. It has carried the griefs and burdens of those who venerate him, who cling to him and seek release from their own uncertainties and sin in the security of his decisiveness, wisdom and strength. He is compelled to spend himself in doing

many things and in doing few of them with a thoroughness that he would like. The manner in which his day is cut up makes him a stranger to consecutive reading. He loses his taste for books. In the endeavor to keep informed on many lines, he does much aimless reading and some useless reading that gives him neither insight, judgment, nor culture. Inroads are made on time that he would gladly reserve for recreation, reading, social intercourse, and prayer. He will get much of his exercise while walking about in the performance of duty or by taking walks late at night. The elderly good priest will display no little ingenuity in the fight to save his traditions of personal piety in the face of demands that almost forbid him to have any piety. Many a time while he is in the crowded streets going from place to place, his hand will steal into his coat pocket, that dear familiar chapel from which so many unsuspected rosaries take "through the boundless air their certain flight" to God.

Contact with the supernatural in administration of the Sacraments, in the celebration of Mass, in preaching and other acts of public worship, should of themselves be an unfailing source of inspiration and purification to every priest. But crowded confessionals give rise to the mental attitude of hurry which robs the confessional experience of much of the spiritual profit that the priest should find in it. The hurry that is associated with the management of Sunday Mass, the visitors who must be seen immediately after Mass, the details of parish business, forethought as to announcements, meetings of societies of all kinds that crowd in on the busy time, leave the priest strangely despoiled of the leisure and spirit so necessary to his traditions of piety and prayer. Routine is inevitable. Routine is system. System chills enthusiasm. Duties that are repeated day after day will sometimes lack the technical finish and dignity of form with which the young priest is so familiar. The routine into which the average priest drifts is nothing other than his solution of the problem of reconciling his limitations and his duties. This development affects his ideals and his attitudes toward life and it becomes an interpretation of his sense of responsibility to souls. Hence it is that impulses and emotions and other forms of feeling tend to take on a deliberateness, if not apathy, that seems inexcusable to the

intemperate energy of the younger priest. He has not yet learned his lesson because he has not yet faced the problem of life.

The careless sinner who stirs the younger colleague's soul into turbulent zeal, leaves the elderly priest calm if not unmoved. Opportunities for doing seemingly great things, prospect of which arouses the younger man to outspoken enthusiasm, awaken scarcely the passing notice of the elderly priest. The latter has worked out his system of discount for impulses, while the former has not yet discovered that that must be done. In addition to routine and experience, the accepted view of the scope of the priesthood in human life that gradually develops becomes a factor of far-reaching influence. An elderly priest has already achieved himself, as the phrase is. He has made his contribution to the priesthood as a whole. He has survived his difficulties and dangers and has reached the placidity that success and certainty engender. Now, if he has a worthy view of the scope of the priesthood in the world, it will feed his enthusiasm and protect him against the narrowing influence of routine and the pessimism that comes from disappointment. Whatever a disinterested observer may think of the view of the priesthood as a whole, that is found among elderly priests, their younger colleague sometimes believes that it is narrow, lacking in inspiration, and too easily satisfied.

It is just possible that an accurate insight into the processes that occur in the transformation of a young into an elderly priest can be found in changing attitudes toward the duty of preaching. If the seminary has done its work well, it has convinced the young priest of the dignity and power of the spoken word. He has learned that it is one of the channels of the tradition of the Incarnation down the centuries. He has learned that there is no greater agency of power at his command than the pulpit. It invites all of the enthusiasm that he can command, all of the talent that he can muster. Not even when his enthusiasm and talent are reënforced by labor and prayer shall the priest ever be too well prepared to stand before the waiting souls and act as the spokesman of God Himself. It is not surprising that the well-trained young priest feels reverence for the duty of preaching and consecrates himself to it with uncomplaining industry. But after a

time, when he must preach thirty, forty, fifty, or sixty times a year before the same congregation, changes occur. The young priest discovers that preaching is but one of many duties, and that when body is tired or mind is tired or attention is diverted, preparation becomes irksome and uninviting. It is not surprising that early in his career many a priest will depend on the "Dabitur tibi", that form of pleasant benediction given often to a priest who is called on to preach without preparation. Of course, if the preacher had leisure for reflection and painstaking study, he would test every sermon in the depths of his own soul before giving it forth as a divine message to the children of God. But when opportunity for personal, intimate preparation of sermons is lacking, the elderly priest may easily drift into a mental attitude that dispenses him from the duty of preparation and permits him to believe that he preaches as effectively without as with it. This error is fatal, of course, to real preaching. One can hardly expect the enriching blessing of God to follow upon sermons that are not well prepared.

One cannot easily describe the complicated transition from the outlook of a young priest to that of an elderly colleague. Perhaps no two would estimate the beginning and the end in the same way or agree on the facts as regards either young priests or their elders. However the transition be described, we must admit that the surrender of the graces of youth or the translation of them into the ripened wisdom of age will be accomplished sometimes wisely, sometimes unwisely. What is taken to be wisdom in the elderly priest may now and then be the hardening of sympathy that is twin brother to pessimism. We would be far happier if we could accumulate experience without hurt to our nobler illusions; if we could become wise without aid from the cynic, practical without ceasing to be exact, effective in life without forfeiting ideals or surrender of the solacing charms of the library and scholarly leisure. But this may not be asked. Young priests who are spiritually minded, zealous, self-confident, inexperienced, who see and know only souls and are stirred by noble illusions, will continue to be transformed into elderly priests and will show forth in their several lives the varying wisdom of their transformation. Elderly priests will continue to be subjected to routine,

to the distraction of multiplied duties and the limitations of life. There are sources of strength and insight in each condition. But there are also dangers and limitations in each. The young priest and his elders cannot but be gainers if they will reflect with honest industry on their mutual obligations.

III.

The elderly priest has a serious duty toward his younger colleague no less than toward the priesthood as a whole. He must realize, for instance, that the only new hope that comes into the priesthood, comes tabernacled in the hearts of young men. Youth alone carries with it the promise of new insight, of wholesome courage, and buoyant self-confidence. Mainly through the better training of young priests does the priesthood take advantage of improved methods of teaching, of new achievements of scholarship, of new insight into the forces that master life. Elderly men may do well in conserving, but to young men must we turn for the prospect of forging ahead. If we fail to take a wide vision of the priesthood, we shall quite overlook this providential function of our younger colleagues; but this intellectual rôle of the younger priests is not for the moment held in mind. What I wish to bring out relates to other aspects of priestly life which are of a more personal character.

The newly ordained priest has an undeniable touch of the prophet about him. Brotherly contact with a noble-minded young priest should be a definite grace to his elder colleague. The latter should renew his vision of souls through the eyes of the former. Through them he should rediscover the spiritual forces that underlie God's judgment of the world. The fearlessness of young men, the enthusiasm and the superb confidence in priestly power that one meets in a good young priest, should give to his elder colleague new self-knowledge, new standards by which to test the piety of his own zeal and the firmness of his consecration. Anyone of us may re-read the history of his own younger priesthood in the clear light of his mature experience, through the aims and emotions, the aspirations and standards of any typical young priest. But in order to do that we must look with reverence, with respect and kindliness on the illusions and earnestness of the untried

Levite. Nothing else in the world could stir so pleasantly the memories of our own forgotten days or awaken sleeping impulses and dormant memories that have become part of our eternity. All good men are reverent toward youth. All good men are willing to learn from the vision of youth. Elderly priests should be reverent toward young priests and should learn from them. A false attitude toward youth indicates a false attitude toward life. Not even the most glaring faults of any young priest can excuse a false attitude toward him in his elder colleague.

There are certain facts that we of the elder generation must accept without flinching. Young priests have their faults, but they have their virtues also. At times our criticisms are directed against their virtues as well as against their faults; not always, but at times. Some of the faults of our younger colleagues are adopted in self-defence against us and our mistaken attitudes toward them. Some of their faults are the outcome of their virtues and temperament. I do not forget that youth may be irreverent and self-sufficient, nor that there are ignoble as well as noble natures among the young. I have no more desire to deify youth than I have to deify age. But if there are mistaken attitudes found between the younger priest and his elders, these latter will have to bear a large share of the fault. Their wisdom should show them how to help the younger colleagues through the rapids that await them. Their experience in dealing with all types of character should show them how to deal with the younger men from whom we may not ask any wisdom except that of youth. If we in the light of experience, grace and prayer cannot through example and advice protect our younger colleagues against their typical mistakes, while saving for them and for the priesthood the graces and vision of youth, the enthusiasm and spiritual instinct developed by careful training, we shall surely fall short of one of the offices of our priesthood. If we could but realize that some of the faults of our younger colleagues are adopted in self-defence against our mistakes in dealing with them, we might be helped in the painful duty of self-correction. There are not a few priests who explain lack of zeal, indifference to mental growth and a certain pessimistic discouragement, by the treatment that they received from their

elderly colleagues in the earlier days of their work in the vineyard of the Lord. When an elderly priest discovers in his younger colleague the promise of genius and abiding power and he goes repeatedly to the tabernacle to thank God for that promise and to protect those gifts by his prayers, we find active in him a noble spiritual ideal. And when the elder man is happy in receiving edification and in feeling stimulated to renewed zeal for personal sanctification and for service of souls through contact with younger priests, we find in him a man whose instincts are true, whose sense of values is right, whose heart's compass is rectified by the hand of God Himself.

It is well for the young priest at the outset of his career to show common sense in the attitude that he takes toward his elders. His life, like all human life, is a process of surrender and exchange. When he finds himself capable of suitable reverence toward his elders, frankly willing to learn from them and prompt to take their advice, all goes well. If the young priest will but understand his own individual limitations, those of his type and those of his outlook, he will dispose himself favorably to the development of the virtues which the world expects to be associated with the graces of youth. The young priest ought to learn to trust those who have gone before him and have measured up to the tests of life. It is due to inexperience that the young priest is inclined to be dogmatic, critical, and intolerant. Now, he has no warrant in being either dogmatic or critical or intolerant. There is no warrant in his wisdom, for he has little of it; nor in achievement, for his life is as yet but promise; nor in character that has withstood the tests of life, since his character has not yet withstood those tests; nor in ripened virtue, since his virtues are largely those of sheltered youth rather than of well-tried age. Nothing can justify a young priest in being critical or dogmatic or intolerant toward his elders. Emerson is quoted as saying that when a young man is willing to accept the wisdom of elder people and abide by it, great things may be expected from him. Hence the young priest who looks for what is strong and right and helpful, for what is creditable and wholesome in the life of his elder colleagues, will be wise beyond his years.

Elderly priests are as they are and younger priests must accept them. They represent the average result achieved in the sacerdotal life in which the demands of heaven and of earth contend for time and mastery, putting on the often wearied heart a supreme test of wisdom, patience, and labor. That all elderly priests, singly and severally, might be nobler, wiser, and more efficient than they are, is beside the question. That they have faults is beside the question. Our concern for the moment is to make sure that the young priest take for his own sake, as well as for the sake of the priesthood, a right attitude toward his elderly colleague. Rarely indeed will there be anything in elderly priests as a whole that can excuse cynical attitudes, superior airs, or chronic fault-finding in a younger man. None of these practices lose any of their ugliness—indeed it is but intensified by contrast—when found in a heart that is intended to house the enthusiasm and impulsive generosity of youth. The young priest need have little concern lest he over-estimate the virtues of his elders. Nothing but good could result from such over-estimation. Nothing but harm can result from under-estimation of it.

The elderly priest who feels in his heart a tenderness toward younger colleagues that merges into yearning, an envy that expresses itself in prayer, a hopefulness that ripens into friendship, cannot but ennoble himself thereby. The young priest who looks with simple reverence toward his elder colleagues; whose heart is thrilled with pride in the record of their exacting work; who finds it easy to explain and still easier to overlook their shortcomings; who finds with sure instinct what is helpful and honorable in their lives, gives promise of wisdom that will honor his priesthood and insight that will protect his peace. These thoughts may perhaps throw new light upon the well-worn words that we have so often uttered without particular care: "Ecce quam bonum et quam jucundum habitare fratres in unum."

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

CATHOLICITY IN MODERN RUMANIA.

NOW that the centre of gravity of the present conflict has been shifted to the near East, it will not be without interest to give a brief account of the actual situation of our co-religionists in that most important and progressive near Eastern state, Rumania. With this end in view, the author will first call to the reader's attention a few facts concerning the geography and political history of the country in question.

The kingdom of Rumania is bordered by Austria on the north, by Bulgaria on the south, by Russia and the Black Sea on the east, and by Hungary on the west. It has an area of 53,489 square miles, somewhat less than that of the combined States of New York and Massachusetts. The last census (1910) gives a population of 7,508,000. Modern Rumania represents the famous Dacia of ancient days, which the Emperor Trajan colonized with Roman subjects, who left on the region the impress of their own language, so that no matter how mixed with Slavic, Hungarian, and Turco-Tartar idioms, the Rumanian is essentially a Roman tongue.

A commission of the representatives of the great powers that signed the Treaty of Paris in March, 1856, was sent to the two principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia (which now form the kingdom of Rumania) to learn the wishes of the people concerning their own government. This commission caused a convention to be held in Paris in 1858, which resulted in a constitutional government being granted to these old "Danubian principalities". They remained, however, under Turkish suzerainty and were not to be united. Nevertheless in 1859 a personal union was effected when Colonel Alexandru Joan Cuza was elected prince of Moldavia, and some days after to the same dignity in Wallachia. As there was no stipulation to the contrary, the election was lawful and the Sublime Porte ratified it. Prince Cuza established a common ministry and a common representative assembly for the two provinces. In 1864 this assembly was abolished and a new constitution gave the country two assemblies and a code based on the Napoleonic code. Public instruction was made free and compulsory, and the peasants were given possession of the land. By the same act, serfdom, tithes, etc., were abolished.

The Greek Orthodox monasteries, endowed by the generosity of the Fanariote Hospodars, were secularized.

As the Boyars (noblemen) were displeased with the new order of things, and the entire country was in a state of great unrest and undergoing a financial crisis owing to these radical changes, Prince Cuza became unpopular. On 22 February, 1866, an army rebellion deposed him. Count Philip of Flanders, brother of the late King Leopold II of Belgium, and father of the present King Albert, was chosen to succeed Prince Cuza, but declined the honor. Then, under the guidance of Bismarck and with the consent of Napoleon III, a Catholic prince, Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, was elected as an hereditary prince, April, 1866. Under his government much was done for the betterment of the country and the reorganization of the army.

When in 1877 war broke out between Russia and Turkey, Rumania made a treaty with the Czar, allowing his troops to cross her boundary to attack Turkey, and on 22 May, 1877, she rejected her vassalage to the Porte. She helped Russia very materially in the war against Turkey. As a consequence of the Berlin Congress (July, 1878) she gave Southern Bessarabia to Russia and received, much to her dissatisfaction, the Dobrucha in return. In March of 1882 Prince Charles was crowned king as Carol the First.

The two principalities of Rumania received the Faith as early as the fourth century, and the Bishop of Tomi (not far from the modern Constanza) was metropolitan of the province of Scythia. As these principalities had, *ab antiquo*, two different ecclesiastical administrations, I propose to consider them under separate headings.

WALLACHIA.

In the fifteenth century this region was united to northern Bulgaria and entrusted to the care of the Franciscan Fathers of the Bosnian province of St. John of Capistrano.

At the time of the Reformation much harm was done to Catholicism in Wallachia, the majority of the people becoming Protestants or Greek schismatics. Needless to say, the numerous Latin sees erected in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in this country of the "Cumans" had a rather short

existence, owing to the Tartar invasions, the Greek schism, and the Turkish oppression. The Holy See, which was just then inaugurating the new method of missionary work, gave the country to the conventual Franciscan Friars; and if the few Catholics who remained faithful had their spiritual needs attended to, praise must indeed be given to these religious. In 1633 they succeeded in erecting a Catholic Church in Bukarest. Meanwhile the incumbent of the see of Sofia (Bulgaria) was made Administrator Apostolic of Wallachia, and by degrees the Observant Franciscans replaced the conventuals in that province. During the plague of 1792-93, Bishop Paul Dovanlia, of the see of Nicopolis, Bulgaria (whose incumbents since 1713 had been the Apostolic Administrators of Wallachia), after the suppression of the see of Sofia came to reside in the Franciscan house at Bukarest, where he remained until his death.

In 1781, Pope Pius VI gave the Wallachian and northern Bulgarian mission to the then newly founded Passionist Congregation. The Passionist Fathers were to work conjointly with the Franciscan Fathers, the builders of the mission. Some misunderstandings occurred, and as a consequence Bishop Fortunatus Ercolani, a Passionist, like his predecessor and several of his successors, was transferred to Cività Castellana, thus happily ending the question.

It was only in 1847 that Bishop Joseph Malaioni succeeded in establishing his residence in Bukarest, as it was not until then that the Orthodox metropolitan would tolerate any Catholic prelate here. Until that time the Bishop was obliged to reside at Cioplea, a little Catholic village near Bukarest, founded by Bulgarian refugees early in the nineteenth century.

In the late 'fifties Bishop Angelo Parsi built a new church and restored the episcopal residence at Bukarest. In 1853 he brought the English Ladies and in 1861 the Christian Brothers to Bukarest. After 1882, when Rumania was made a kingdom, King Carol's government became anxious to have its Catholic subjects released from dependence on a foreign bishop. On 27 April, 1883, Pope Leo XIII, by the brief, *Praecipuum munus*, erected Bukarest as an archbishopric, with Bishop Ignatius Paoli as its first incumbent. The Bishop of Nicopolis lost as a consequence all jurisdiction in Wallachia and, returning to Bulgaria, chose Roustchouk as his residence.

The archdiocese of Bukarest is immediately subjected to the Holy See and is under the S. Congregation of the Propaganda. The successors of the first bishop were in turn Paul Joseph Palma (1885-1892) and Otto Zardetti (1894-1895). This last-named prelate claims our attention for some moments, as he had been from 1889-1894 a member of the American hierarchy, being the first Bishop of St. Cloud, Minnesota. While he was visiting his native country (Switzerland) he met King Carol in the Engadine, where he was spending the summer. The prelate and the monarch soon became friends, and Bishop Zardetti (who was descended from one of the patrician families of Rorschach) was selected by King Carol as the new archbishop of Bukarest. This see was then without a titular, and some say that King Carol was even thinking of having a cardinal as bishop of his capital. At any rate, the Holy See agreed to have the prelate transferred to Bukarest, Rumania, from St. Cloud, Minnesota. This combination, however, proved unfortunate, for Bishop Zardetti spent only a year in Rumania. He resigned his see in 1895 and passed the remainder of his life in Rome, where he died in 1902. His successor was Franciscus Xaverius de Hornstein, formerly dean of Porrentruy in the Jura Bernois, Switzerland. This prelate built a very handsome episcopal residence in Bukarest and brought back the Christian Brothers to the city. He died in 1905 and was succeeded by the present incumbent, Raymundus Netzhammer, O.S.B., who was born in 1862 at Erzingen, Grand Duchy of Baden. In 1881 he made his religious profession in the famous Benedictine monastery at Einsiedeln, Switzerland, and was consecrated archbishop of Bukarest 16 September, 1905.

The last available statistics of the archdiocese of Bukarest gives a population of about 56,000 Catholics of the Latin rite and about 5,000 Uniate Rumanians, chiefly immigrants from Transylvania and Banat (Hungary). The cathedral chapter, erected 13 January, 1887, consists at present of four canons and one honorary canon, besides four honorary canons outside the diocese. There can be six titular and twelve honorary canons. There are forty-three priests in the archdiocese, of whom six are Passionists (in the last two decades this congregation has given up the majority of its missions in Rumania,

seculars having taken the place of the religious), one a Benedictine, and one a Dominican. There are twenty-four parishes, of which one in the city of Bukarest itself is Greek-Rumanian and has about 2,000 communicants. Of the above mentioned priests, nineteen are stationed at the capital, which numbers 300,000 inhabitants. More than 210,000 of these are Orthodox Rumanians; 45,000, Jews; and about two-thirds of the balance, Latin Catholics (chiefly Germans). There is a seminary at Bukarest, with four professors and nineteen students; six other students are trained outside the diocese. This seminary gives a college course of classical studies and philosophy. Theology is generally studied by the students at Rome or Genoa, Italy.

Primary Catholic instruction is well provided for, as all parish churches have schools. In Bukarest the Christian Brothers, numbering twenty-six, conduct three high schools, with an attendance of more than one thousand boys. The opposition of the Rumanian government has, up to the present, prevented the establishment of a Catholic college. To the writer's knowledge the Barnabite Fathers from France were refused permission to open a college at Bukarest when they applied, with the archbishop's full approval, for the necessary authorization.

The English Ladies, numbering two hundred and fifty-five, have two houses in Bukarest, and one each in Braila, Craiova, and Turna-Severin. They conduct five boarding-schools having more than seven hundred inmates, also eight primary schools with over fifteen hundred girls. They have charge of an orphanage with twenty-five orphans. The Sœurs de Sion have one community of thirty-seven sisters in Bukarest and a boarding-school with one hundred and forty girls. The Sisters of Charity have a house of four sisters. There are nine Hungarian Catholic schools, of which two are in Bukarest.

The church in Wallachia is supported by the voluntary offerings of the faithful. In these Oriental countries this means very little help, owing to the modest circumstances of the Catholics. There are three privileged parishes to which the government has granted ten hectares (French measure) of land. The others have no governmental support whatever.

The great majority of Catholics in this region are not Rumanians but Germans from Austria and Hungary, Hungarians and Slovaks. Several other nationalities are represented in lesser numbers. The German language is spoken by the greater part of the population; the Hungarian is next in importance. The seminary at Bukarest has German as its official language, and of the forty-three priests of the archdiocese only four cannot converse in that tongue. In the country districts the population is often scattered over a very large area, thus rendering the work of the priests very difficult. Owing to the number of different nationalities which make up the population of the country, every priest must know at least three languages. More than half of the clergy know four, and some even five.

MOLDAVIA.

In 1369, more than a century after the great Tartar invasion which destroyed all the Latin sees of what is now known as northern Transylvania, Bukowina, and northern Moldavia, Prince Ladzo or Ladislaus of Moldavia, following the example of the eastern Emperor Johannes Paleologus the Elder, made his submission to Rome. As a consequence, he asked Pope Urban V to erect an episcopal see at Serth. His request was granted in 1370 and the first incumbent of the new see was a conventual Franciscan, Nicholas Andrea Wassilo. He became Administrator of Haliz in modern eastern Galicia in 1373 and Bishop of Wilna in Lithuania in 1388. In 1497, on account of the Turkish persecution in that part of the country, the bishopric was transferred from Serth to Bacau. Thus, as in Wallachia, other Latin sees founded by the zeal of the Sovereign Pontiffs lasted only a short time. Toward the end of the sixteenth century the titulars of these sees were often coadjutors of Cracow. It is very sad to note that in the sixteenth century the population almost unanimously embraced Protestantism.

The restoration of the see of Bacau in 1607 by Pope Clement VIII did little or nothing to strengthen the Catholic position. One must not wonder at this, however, as the bishops, owing to the presence of the Turks, and even more to the antagonistic attitude of the Greek metropolitans, resided almost entirely outside their sees. The care of the few Catholics was

left to the Dominican and Franciscan missionaries. Nevertheless the see of Bacau existed for many years, its first incumbent, after the restoration, being the Franciscan Bernardus Quirini.

In 1752 Pope Benedict XIV transferred the see to Sniatyn on the boundary between modern Galicia and the Crownland of Bukowina, which was shortly afterward taken by Austria. However in 1814, with the death of Bonaventura Carinzi, a Franciscan prelate, the see lost its last pastor and was suppressed in 1818. The Propaganda then resorted to the *modus vivendi* of a Vicar Apostolic for Moldavia. The first was Bonaventura Zaberroni, who took possession in 1825. Such was the state of things when, on 27 June, 1884, Pope Leo created the diocese of Jassy, thus putting an end to the Vicariate Apostolic of Moldavia. The first bishop was Joseph Camilli, a conventual Franciscan. On 8 January, 1895, he was succeeded by another conventual, Dominic Jacquet, guardian of the Franciscan monastery in Fribourg, Switzerland. In 1904 the latter resigned and was succeeded by his predecessor, Bishop Camilli.

There are about 90,000 Catholics in the diocese of Jassy, of whom more than 3,000 are in the city of Jassy. The rest are scattered throughout the country districts, where one meets whole villages that are Catholic. In the county of Romana, for instance, there are six Catholic parishes and 18,000 faithful. There are forty-five priests in the diocese, twelve of whom are seculars and the rest minor conventuals. These religious, who are sent to the Moldavian mission from all provinces of the order, had until quite recently no canonical houses, but simply parishes. They now have eleven of the latter.

There are twenty-seven parishes in the diocese, and ninety-four chapels without resident priests, besides eleven chapels for religious communities. There is a religious seminary at Jassy, in charge, until recently, of the Polish Jesuits of Galicia, and two preparatory seminaries, one at Jassy and another at Haulacesti. In the last place Bishop Jacquet founded a remarkable school for catechists, who exercise their beneficial teaching in those far-away districts which are rarely reached by a priest but which have parish schools. In Mol-

davia all Catholic parishes are endowed by the government. To every priest is given ten hectares of land. In this lot the ground under the church is not included, nor the rectory with its adjoining buildings, nor the vegetable garden and orchard.

The Catholics of the diocese are, in the majority of cases, descendants of former Hungarian colonists now Rumanized. The rest are Germans from Germany and Austria and Poles from Galicia and Bukowina. Of the 90,000 Catholics, there are some few hundred Uniate Rumanians, Ruthenians, and Armenians from Transylvania, Bukowina, and Galicia. There are two boarding-schools for girls at Jassy and Galatz under the care of the Sœurs de Sion. The attendance numbers one hundred and forty-three. As in Wallachia, no college for boys is allowed by the government.

As things are now, the outlook for Catholicism in Rumania is far from bright. Compared with the ante-bellum state of things in Russia, for instance, religious freedom is remarkable in Rumania; but when we come down to details we find many things are still lacking. Proselytizing among the Orthodox is well-nigh impossible; and should it be crowned with success, the government puts so many formalities between the neophite and his reception into the Church that there is room for discouragement even in the stoutest heart.

The Sœurs de Sion of Galatz told the writer in 1908 that they had been on the verge of having their house closed in 1904 on account of politico-religious troubles with the government. They were compelled to appear before the authorities in Bukarest, but were finally exonerated. Every Catholic school teacher has to pass very strict examinations, not always conducted in a very friendly spirit.

The Rumanian higher class is very refined, very elegant, very *parisien*. French is still the received language, and the daughter of the family is often sent to a Catholic boarding school. The moral standing of the country in general is very low. The long Turkish rule and the unfortunate state of semi-slavery of the people under the Hospodars account for this. Everyone knows that the Orthodox church can do very little to better the condition. To the mind of the Rumanian gentleman, Catholicism is a fairly tolerable *article d'importa-*

tion, good for his daughter when she is young, as far as its indirect influence goes, of course. But to become a communicant of that faith would put one on the level with the Hungarian housemaid or the German shopkeeper round the corner. To the Orthodox monk and parish priest, it is a vile foreign importation tolerated wrongly by those in authority. No real Rumanian could join it!

It is hard to treat some facts fairly, but one must place them before the reader. Everyone conversant with the state of things in Transylvania knows that there is room for improvement in the *modus vivendi* between the Hungarian government and the numerous Catholic and Orthodox Rumanians who make up the bulk of the population there. It makes the heart of every patriotic Rumanian bleed. Now Catholic Hungarians are quite at home in Rumania, and have, as was said above, nine schools in the diocese of Bukarest. These are all Latin Catholic schools. *Inde irae!*

In the presence of these and other facts Bishop Jacquet, an uncommonly learned and zealous prelate, noted that all these communities in Rumania had, voluntarily or involuntarily, a rather foreign character, which was exaggerated by the Orthodox clergy as a characteristic of Catholicism itself. The late King Carol, for instance, refused to have in the sees of Bukarest or Jassy any subject of the European great powers, so Swiss prelates were generally chosen as the incumbents of these sees. Bishop Jacquet, remaining within the boundaries of the strictest Catholicism, did his best to Rumanize his flock —that is, those among them who were born in Rumania and were subjects of the kingdom. The result was very sad. From the most unexpected Catholic quarters arose strong opposition. The good Bishop, whom the writer had the privilege to know while he was a student at Fribourg, seeing that not only were his efforts vain, but that he himself became the subject of attack, resigned after nine years and returned to his native land, where he again became professor at the University of Fribourg. But this was not enough; for the prelate's opponents now became his persecutors. He who, regardless of the fact that he was a minor conventual himself, took several parishes from his confrères to give them to the Rumanian Catholic secular clergy, as he ardently had longed

to do, was accused of favoring his order to the detriment of his diocesan priests. The fact that he tried to be on friendly terms with the Orthodox led him to be accused of making concessions to schism. The prelate had to appear before the tribunal of the Holy Office. Needless to say, he was exonerated of such baseless charges. He received the titular archdiocesan see of Salamina and, after some years spent in Fribourg, he is now prefect of studies of his order in Rome.

This prelate belongs to the happily growing list of those Latin missionaries in the near East who understand that they have not discharged their full duty in caring for the few Latin Catholics residing there, but that a part of their work is to try to win over to the true allegiance the Orthodox laity and clergy, not forgetting that their bishops are bishops just as ours, their priests are priests just as ours, and that many of their episcopal sees (sometimes as old and respectable as that of Tomi, near Constanza, whose bishop was a personal friend of St. John Chrysostom), once ranked in importance next to that of the Western Patriarch, whose communion their former occupants have rejected.

P. J. SANDALGI.

Curtis Bay, Maryland.

THE WAY OF THE CROSS.

A Summary of the Legislation of the Church on the Stations of the Cross.

THIS article deals only with the canonical and practical questions concerning the Way of the Cross. Those interested in the history of the Stations will find Father Herbert Thurston's book [1] of great help. His work has been supplemented and in some points corrected by Fr. Michael Bihl, O.F.M.[2]

The places of the Holy Land sanctified by the presence of our Saviour in His human form were from the earliest times objects of special devotion on the part of the Christian world. The place where Jesus had suffered and died was all the

[1] *The Stations of the Cross.* An Account of their History and Devotional Purpose. London, 1906, Burns and Oates.

[2] *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, vol. I, pp. 50 ff.

dearer to them on that account. In every century of the Christian era we read of great numbers of pilgrims visiting the holy places in Jerusalem. In the course of time certain scenes from the sorrowful journey of Christ, beginning at Pilate's house and ending on Mount Calvary, were reproduced in many churches in Europe or outside the churches in separate small shrines, for the purpose of fostering devotion to our Lord's Passion. These representations, called later on Stations, varied greatly in number. In some places there were seven, called the "Seven Falls of our Lord"; in other places twelve, fourteen, and considerably more. The fourteen Stations were finally established throughout the world, when the S. Congregation in an Instruction of 3 April, 1731, fixed the fourteen representations as a necessary condition for gaining the indulgences of the Way of the Cross. The Order of Friars Minor, which has been in charge of the Holy Places of Palestine for over six hundred years and has sacrificed many a priest and brother in defence of the revered shrines, did much to promote the devotion to the Passion of Christ by erecting the Stations in the churches of their Order and inculcating meditation on the sad events of Good Friday.

Pope Innocent XII, on 24 December, 1692, granted the same indulgences as those gain who visit the holy places in Palestine to the persons belonging to the churches, places, orders, and confraternities under the obedience or direction of the Minister General of the Friars Minor. Pope Benedict XIII, on 3 March, 1726, granted to *all the faithful* the privilege of gaining the indulgences of the Way of the Cross, provided they make the Stations in places subject to or under the direction of the Franciscans. He also declared that the indulgences are applicable to the poor souls. Finally Pope Clement XII, on 16 January, 1731, at the request of the General of the Franciscan Order, made it possible for all the faithful to gain the indulgences of the Stations anywhere, provided the Stations had been erected by the authority of the said General.

For the sake of clearness the laws affecting the Stations will be considered under the following heads:

I. From whom permission to erect the Stations must be obtained.

II. Essential conditions to be observed in their erection.

III. Prayers to be said for the gaining of the indulgences attached.

IV. Reasons why the Stations become invalidated so as to necessitate a new blessing.

V. Revalidation of Stations invalidly erected.

The present article will take into consideraton and sum up all the questions that have appeared in the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW from its beginning to the present time.

I. PERMISSION TO ERECT THE STATIONS.

The ordinary power of erecting the Stations rests with the Minister General of the Friars Minor, who can give the faculty to bishops and other priests.[3] The other superiors, namely the provincial, the guardians or superiors of large communities and the superiors of residences, can delegate the faculty only to the priests subject to them who are approved for preaching or at least for confessions,[4] and they can delegate them to erect the Stations only within the territory of their respective jurisdiction, i. e. the provincial within the limits of the province, the superiors of monasteries and residences within the town or city where such house exists.

The Holy See at times also gives the faculty of erecting the Stations to bishops and in the United States the episcopal faculty reads: "To erect the Stations of the Way of the Cross in places within their dioceses where there are no Franciscan Fathers, and to attach to the Stations all the indulgences and privileges which the Supreme Pontiffs have granted to those who make this pious exercise. Moreover the power is given them to communicate this faculty to the priests who exercise the sacred ministry in their diocese." [5] The bishop is advised in delegating this faculty to mention that he does so by Apostolic indult. This is not necessary, however, for validity.[6]

Therefore the Bishops of the United States can erect the Stations, either in person or through one of their priests, in any place of their diocese, except where there is a house of the Franciscan Fathers. By this only the Order of Friars

[3] *Decr. Authentica S. C. Indulg.*. 3 April, 1731, N. 100, ad 1um.

[4] Ibid.. 26 September. 1892; *Acta Ord. Minorum*, Vol. XI (1892), p. 182.

[5] Facultates Extraordinariae, tabella C, No. 10.

[6] S. C. Indulg., 6 Aug. 1890, ECCL. REVIEW, vol. IV, p. 388.

Minor is meant. In places where there are houses of the Conventual or Black Franciscans and of the Capuchin Franciscans the bishop may use his faculty.

The S. Congregation of Indulgences has interpreted[7] the clause "in places in which there are no Franciscan Fathers" as meaning within the limits of the town or city, with its suburbs and environments, where the Franciscans have a house. If a section of such a city belongs to another diocese, that part is not considered as belonging to the city or place where the Franciscan Fathers are. Hence the bishop of that part of the city would be free to use his faculty from the Holy See. If a bishop authorizes the erection of the Stations in a place where the Franciscans are, the erection is null and void, for he cannot do so without having the Franciscans bless the Stations, and the superior of the Franciscan house has no power to delegate a secular priest or to allow the bishop to delegate one of his priests.

The Stations may be erected in any church, chapel, or becoming place in the open, as well as in private oratories where by Papal indult Holy Mass may be celebrated. As the faculty of our Bishops speaks of places in general where they may erect the Stations, their power extends to all these places. But in private houses neither the Minister General of the Franciscans nor the Bishops by virtue of the faculty referred to can erect the Stations. A special indult of the Holy See is necessary for that purpose.

II. Essential Conditions to be Observed in the Erection of the Stations.

Under pain of nullity:

1. Bishop's consent in writing; the pastor's for a church or chapel under his jurisdiction or care; the superior's or superioress's for chapels of institutions of which they have charge.[8]

2. Delegation in writing by the bishop, or the superior of the Franciscans in places where they have a house.

3. Fourteen crosses of wood. No other material is valid. These crosses must be blessed in the place where they are to

[7] *Decr. Auth. S. C. Indulg.* 14 Dec. 1857, No. 382, and Decretum S. C. Indulg. 18 Aug. 1903. *Acta Minorum*, vol. XXIII, p. 59.

[8] Cf. Eccl. Review, vol. IX, p. 59; vol. X, p. 72.

be erected and with the formula given in the Roman Ritual for that purpose.

A few words of explanation on each of these points will not be superfluous.

First condition. These are the only points necessary for the valid erection, but the S. Congregation of Indulgences requires for licity that the request to the bishop for his consent be made in writing.[9] It is the best and easiest way, since the bishop need merely write on the same letter of request that he consents and sign his name. If the bishop also adds that he delegates the pastor (in places where there are no Franciscans) to erect the Stations, the one letter serves for all the essential formality, as it expresses in the request the pastor's consent and in the bishop's notation the delegation and his consent. This suffices for a parochial church or a mission chapel.

In chapels attached to hospitals and other pious institutions and in large convents where there are authorized chaplains, they are required to give their consent in writing, and so must the superior of the house. The S. Congregation of Indulgences has declared that for such places the consent of the pastor of the parish in the limits of which the institution exists is not necessary for the erection of the Stations, provided the bishop has given the chaplain full parochial rights over the institution.[10]

For the erection of the Stations in churches and chapels under the jurisdiction or permanent care of exempt regulars (e. g. Benedictines, Dominicans, Jesuits, Franciscans, etc.), the bishop's consent is not required by law, but the necessary condition is that the religious have their residence at the church or chapel.[11]

Second condition. The bishop delegates as a rule the pastor, or the chaplain, who asks for permission to have the Stations in the church or chapel, and this delegation to be valid can be given only for individual cases, not in general, and must always be given in writing.[12] If the Stations are to

[9] Cf. ECCL. REVIEW, vol. IV, p. 388.

[10] *Decr. auth.* S. C. Indulg., 21 June, 1879, No. 445.

[11] *Decr. auth.* S. C. Indulg., 20 July, 1868, No. 424; also S. C. Indulg., 26 Sept. 1892; *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. 25, p. 317 ad 9^{um}, 10^{um}, 11^{um}.

[12] ECCL. REVIEW. vol. IV, p. 388, and vol. IX, p. 59.

be erected in a place where the Franciscans are, they must be asked to bless the Stations, and if the superior does not perform the ceremony he must delegate in writing one of his subjects. If he performs the blessing personally, he, like anyone else who blesses the Stations, is to certify to the blessing and sign his name to it. Though the Holy See strictly insists on having the document of the erection drawn up and signed, the neglect of this formality does not invalidate the erection of the Stations.

The bishop's permission or consent, in writing as said before, must be obtained also in case the Franciscans bless the Stations in a church administered by secular clergy or not under the control of an exempt Order.

Third condition.[13] Fourteen crosses of wood are essential, and to these only, not to the picture, the indulgences are attached. Scenes from our Lord's Passion are not essential to the Stations, but the Holy See strongly recommends them, according to the established custom. As a rule the crosses are placed above the pictures, and that is their proper place; but they may be attached to the wall or to the pews,[14] provided the pews are fastened to the floor and the crosses are high enough to be fairly conspicuous.

Large crosses, with the pictures fastened in the centre of the intersecting arms so that only the extremities of the cross are visible, have been accepted as valid by the S. Congregation of Indulgences,[15] but new Stations of that kind are forbidden to be blessed. The reason for this is that all churches should conform to the universal custom.

If the crosses are so encased with metal or other material that the wood of the crosses is almost entirely or altogether covered, the indulgences cannot be gained.

If the crosses of the Stations are of metal or stone or other material, wooden crosses must be attached to them in such a manner as to render the wood visible.[16] If the wooden crosses are placed back of the metal or stone crosses so as to be hidden from the view of those making the Stations, the indulgences cannot be gained.

[13] Cf. ECCL. REVIEW, vol. I, p. 378.

[14] S. C. Indulg., 14 Sept., 1904. Acta S. Sedis, vol. 37, p. 395.

[15] S. C. Indulg., 27 March, 1901. Acta Minorum, vol. xx, p. 126.

[16] *Decr. auth. S. C. Indulg.* No. 442 ad 2um.

In blessing the crosses the formula of the Roman Ritual for the blessing of the Via Crucis must be followed, and the priest must be duly authorized, as explained above. For the pictures there is also a blessing in the Ritual, but the S. Congregation of Indulgences has declared that this blessing is not necessary,[17] though it may be given.

The Stations, i. e. the pictures as well as the crosses, may either be blessed and then hung on the wall, or they may be put up first and blessed on the wall. For greater solemnity the Stations are often blessed first and then attached to the wall by the priest who gives the blessing or somebody assisting him, while the prayers for the respective Stations are recited. All this is left to the discretion of the priest who arranges the ceremony. It is not necessary that the Stations and crosses be put in their place the day they are blessed, but the indulgences cannot be gained until the Stations are placed on the wall.[18]

The blessing would be invalid, however, if the priest were to bless the crosses outside and away from the church or place where they are to be erected,[19] for the minister who blesses the Stations must be *morally* present in the place for which the Stations are destined. In convents of Sisters who have strict enclosure, the Stations for their chapel can be blessed in the parlor at the grate.

There must be *some distance*[20] between each Station or cross for the validity of the Stations; hence the S. Congregation of Indulgences forbids the erection of the Stations in chapels that are so narrow that the entire Way of the Cross is made in two or three steps.

In very small chapels of Sisters' convents the pictures are hung one close to the other. Are these Stations valid? It would seem so, as long as the crosses are some distance apart, because the decree requires only *aliqualis distantia.*

It makes no difference whether the Stations begin on the Gospel or Epistle side of a church or chapel. There is no law or regulation on that point except that the S. C. of In-

[17] Ibid., No. 270 ad 2um.

[18] *Decr. auth. S. C. Indulg.*, No. 447.

[19] ECCL. REVIEW, vol. XX, p. 512.

[20] *Decr. auth. S. C. Indulg.*, No. 194 ad 1um.

dulgences requests that the custom of the country be followed.

If the church has a chapel attached to it, even though it is part of the church itself, the Stations may also be erected, with the prescribed formalities, in this chapel, besides the Stations in the church proper. In churches of monasteries where there is a choir behind the main altar, the Stations may be erected for the convenience of the religious.

III. Prayers to be Said to Gain the Indulgences.

According to the Instruction of the S. C. of Indulgences,[21] it is necessary to meditate, no matter how briefly, on the Passion of our Lord and to say, according to custom, one Our Father and Hail Mary, and make an act of contrition. The short meditation alone is essential and may be done according to one's capacity.[22] If one reads thoughtfully the short reflexion on the scene represented by the Station, as most prayer-books have them in one form or another, it is sufficient. The five Our Fathers and Hail Marys recited in many churches at the end of the Stations are not prescribed.

Another condition is to move from Station to Station, as far as the place permits. This condition is essential for the gaining of the indulgences, though in the following cases the Holy See has to some extent dispensed from this condition.

1. When the Stations are made publicly by the priest with the people and there is not room for all to move about, or, as would be the case in most churches, confusion would result, it is sufficient that the priest and two altar-boys go from Station to Station and that the people answer the prayers. Such is the method prescribed by the S. C. of Indulgences.[23]

2. When the church is so large that the priest going round the Stations could not be understood by the people, the S. C. of Indulgences declared in an answer given a bishop in Holland through the S. C. of the Propaganda,[24] that a priest in the pulpit could recite the prayers "provided another priest with two clerics (altar-boys) goes round and halts at each

[21] Ibid., No. 100 ad 5um et 6um.

[22] Ibid., No. 259.

[23] Ibid., No. 210.

[24] S. C. de Prop. Fide, 1 March, 1884, in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, vol. XXVII, p. 447.

Station. By observing this condition, which is to be counted as essential in the Way of the Cross, the indulgences can be gained without obtaining a special indult." From this it follows that if the priest in the pulpit reads the Stations, but there is no other priest at hand, the indulgences cannot be gained unless the bishop obtains a special indult for this manner of making the Stations. That this is the mind of the Holy See is also apparent from another decision of the S. C. of Indulgences quoted in the *Revue Théologique*,[25] and from a further declaration of that same Congregation on 23 July, 1757.[26] Moreover, in the special concessions of this kind the S. C. of Indulgences explicitly declares that they are made exclusively for the dioceses to which they are granted and cannot be understood as general.

3. In chapels of religious where there is not sufficient room for all to move from Station to Station, it is enough that one of the religious, who need not be a priest, goes round and says the prayers and that the others answer.[27] In convents of Sisters under the same conditions, a Sister can go round saying the prayers.[28]

The Stations must be said without interruption,[29] but if this interruption is not very long and only for the purpose of attending to other spiritual works, like the hearing of Holy Mass, the reception of Holy Communion, the going to confession, one does not have to begin over again to gain the indulgences.[30]

At the time of Holy Mass or other sacred functions, e. g. Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, the Stations should not be made.[31] The question has been raised whether there is any prohibition to say the Stations in a church where the Bl. Sacrament is exposed, e. g. for Forty Hours' Devotion. All

[25] Vol. XV, p. 115. It may be added that the Stations may be left uncovered during Passiontide, though the general Rubric requires all pictures and crucifixes to be covered. Cf. ECCL. REVIEW, vol. I, p. 112.

[26] *Muenster Pastoralblatt*, vol. I, p. 124; ECCL. REVIEW, vol. XXVI, p. 460, and vol. L, p. 346.

[27] S. C. Indulg. 27 Feb. 1901, *Collect. S. C. de Prop. Fide*. No. 2102.

[28] S. C. Indulg. 7 Maj. 1902, ibidem in nota.

[29] *Decr. auth. S. C. Indulg.*, No. 385 ad 1um.

[30] Ibid., No. 223 ad 4um.

[31] Ibid., No. 100 ad 7um.

that can be learned from the official declarations is the Instruction of the S. Congregation of Indulgences just referred to in this paragraph, viz. that at the time of divine services (divinorum officiorum) and of Holy Mass the faithful should abstain from making the Stations. The ECCL. REVIEW has answered this question in the same sense (Vol. XVI, p. 434), adding that De Herdt and other rubricists say that the Stations should not be made while such functions are going on. It seems to be according to the mind of the Church that when her public functions should engage the attention of the faithful, private devotion, like the Way of the Cross, should not be preferred.

Whether the indulgences of the Way of the Cross can be gained repeatedly on the same day by repeating the Stations, has never been decided. The S. C. of Indulgences, when requested to give a decision on this point, only answered that from the official documents it was not sure whether or not they could be gained several times a day.[32] But in the Franciscan Order it has been always the persuasion that the indulgences can be gained repeatedly on the same day, nor has this opinion ever been objected to by the Holy See. All authors agree that the partial indulgences connected with the Stations can be gained repeatedly.

IV. REASONS WHY THE WAY OF THE CROSS BECOMES INVALIDATED.[33]

If the pictures are to be replaced by new ones while the old crosses are attached to the new Stations, the indulgences remain, because the blessing is attached to the crosses. Likewise, if some of the crosses are broken or lost, the broken or missing ones can be replaced by others without a new blessing, as long as the old crosses are in the majority. These two points are clearly stated by the S. C. of Indulgences.[34]

If the pictures as well as the crosses are to be changed for entirely new Stations, a new blessing is required; but the formalities are very simple. All that is necessary for renewing the Stations is to have a priest delegated either by the bishop

[32] *Acta Minorum*, 1886, vol. V, p. 54.
[33] Cf. ECCL. REVIEW, vol. I, p. 379.
[34] *Decr. auth. S. C. Indulg.*, No. 258, ECCL. REVIEW, vol. XXII, p. 422.

or the superior of the Franciscan Order, as the case may be, to bless the Stations. The delegation must of course be given in writing.[35]

If the Stations are removed from the church or place for a time, on account of repairs or for other reasons, the indulgences cannot be gained while the Stations are removed, but *as soon as they are replaced the indulgences can be gained.* Nor does it matter whether or not they are erected in the same place as before, for example, if they began on the Epistle side they may be placed so as to start on the Gospel side, and vice versa. The length of time during which the Stations are out of the church does not matter.

If the Stations are erected in another part of the same church during repairs, for instance, all fourteen on one side, or in a chapel which is not separate from the church, e. g. the chapel formed by the cross aisles or transept, the indulgences may be gained.[36]

If a church where the Stations were erected is destroyed and the new church is built on the same spot, though perhaps larger, and the crosses of the old Stations are saved, there would be no need of blessing the Stations again in the new church, provided the old crosses are also erected.[37] It is important, however, to know whether the new church is blessed under the same title; for if the title is changed it is not held to be the same church as the one that was destroyed.

V. Revalidation of Stations Invalidly Erected.

The conditions required under pain of nullity in the erection or for gaining the indulgences must be strictly observed; otherwise the indulgences cannot be gained, even though those who perform the exercises are in good faith. As essential points may easily be overlooked in the erection of the Stations, the Minister General of the Franciscan Order applies from time to time for a *sanatio* or revalidation of all invalidly erected Stations throughout the world. The last *sanatio* for any and all essential defects in the erection of the Stations was obtained 10 March, 1914.[38] Hence all Stations erected

[35] S. C. Indulg. 11 Jan. 1896. *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XXVIII, p. 502.
[36] *Decr. auth. S. C. Indulg.*, No. 223 ad 3um. Eccl. Review, vol. XX, p. 314.
[37] S. C. Indulg. 7 June 1905; *Acta Minorum*. vol. XXIV, p. 245.
[38] *Acta Minorum*, vol. XXXIII, p. 99.

prior to that date are thereby made valid and any irregularities discovered need not be matter of concern, save the following: Some authors, for example Beringer,[39] hold that all the essential conditions that may have been omitted, even the bishop's written permission or consent, or the pastor's, etc. had to be complied with even after the *sanatio*. However, the decree on which they base their argument[40] speaks of a case where the Stations had only the pictures, but no crosses. That the S. C. of Indulgences in this case insisted on private blessing and erection of the wooden crosses is to be explained by the fact that the Way of the Cross does not exist at all if there are no wooden crosses. In the *sanatio* the fundamentals at least have to be there. In like manner, if it is found that the crosses on the Stations are not of wood, wooden crosses must be blessed privately by a priest having the faculty to bless the Stations. Nothing further would be required for Stations erected before 10 March, 1914.

FR. STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M.

Paterson, New Jersey.

MIRACLES AND MODERN THOUGHT.

THE Christian religion stands or falls with miracles. They formed an integral part of our Lord's ministry; they are the sureties of His stupendous claims; they are bound up with the world's conception of Him—the Christ men believe in is One who, as Gregory the Great said, revealed Himself sometimes in words, sometimes in deeds of power; and they constitute the web and woof of the Gospels. The fact that Christ wrought miracles is the best attested fact in the story of His life; and if they are torn from that story and eliminated from that life, the Gospels become a heap of ruins and Christ Himself almost a mythical personage. When miracles are in danger we may say what St. Athanasius said of the great controversy of his time, "Our all is at stake".

And against miracles all who, for many years past, have labored to shatter the worth of the Christian revelation, have in every case directed their fiercest assaults. Their tactics

[39] *Die Ablaesse* (ed. 13a), p. 307.

[40] *Decr. auth. S. C. Indulg.*, No. 261.

change from time to time, but there is no lull in the fight. To discredit miracles, or to whittle them away by reducing them to purely natural occurrences, has been the supreme aim and ambition of those who have resolved that "in the person of Jesus no supernaturalism shall be suffered to remain".

Philosophy and Biblical Criticism join forces in the war against miracles. Of these, the former is, perhaps, the more dangerous, because the view we take of miracles is to a large extent the reflex of the view we take of the universe as a whole. The appeal that evidence makes to us depends more than we realize on the philosophical presuppositions with which we approach the study of it. In this paper it may be worth while to study briefly the argument which widely different schools of philosophy, aided and abetted in these latter days by a certain school of science, have steadily plied against miracles, namely, the mechanistic theory of the world. Pantheists and deists, skeptics, agnostics, and materialists are divided by gulfs and gaps from one another; but, in spite of their warring views on the meaning of the universe, they are fast wedded to the theory that all phenomena, whether of matter or life or mind or personality, are but so many links in an unbroken chain of cause and effect. Whatever exists, they maintain, has come to be what it is in a purely natural way; the present is the inevitable outcome of the past, the future will be the necessary resultant of forces in operation at present. To everything that happens in the universe they would apply, or rather misapply, in their bald literalness, the words of Ecclesiastes: "The thing that hath been is that which shall be, and that which is done is that which shall be done, and there is no new thing under the sun." It is the mechanistic view of nature, born in the very dawn of modern philosophy, with which miracles at once come into sharp collision wherever and whenever the subject is broached.

Descartes was the first to regard all movements of matter as mechanical in origin and all movements of animal life as automatic responses to stimuli. Descartes, however, was not a mechanist in the full sense of the term; Spinoza it was who, as he was the first in modern times to launch an attack against miracles, was also the first to inoculate modern thought with the absolute uniformity of nature. There is but one substance,

he declared, and only one, infinite, eternal, self-existent, of which all finite existences are only modes, flowing from the eternal essence as inevitably as the attributes of a triangle from its configuration. "Nature," he wrote, "always observes laws and rules, though they may not be all known to us, which involve eternal necessity and truth, and so preserves a fixed and immutable order." Human freedom, true to his principles, he sweeps aside: "The mind is determined to will this or that by a cause, which again is determined by another cause, and this by another, and so on to infinity." Men are deceived, he insists, in thinking themselves free; such an impression arises from the fact that they are conscious of their actions but ignorant of the causes by which they are determined. Thus, the "Father of modern Pantheism" was essentially a mechanist. He left no room for freedom, neither on the part of God, all of whose activities are determined by the nature of His being, nor on the part of man, all of whose activities proceed likewise in accordance with undeviating law. This denial of freedom, it will be noted, generally follows on the denial of miracles.

While Pantheism identified God and Nature, Deism rigidly separated them; but in Deism, no less than in Pantheism, the mechanical conception of the world held an essential place. God, it was declared, created the heavens and the earth, and then left them to themselves. He imparted to the universe the energy which served as the driving power of the vast mechanism, but threw upon natural law the burden of regulating the world. Deism was practical atheism. It professed a belief in God, but what it gave with one hand it took away with the other. It had a short and stormy career, and was soon forgotten.

David Hume, "prince of skeptics", was the man whose arraignment of miracles did more to prejudice their cause than the work of all who went before and all who came after him. His argument has colored speculation on the subject since his day, and it retains much of its power and popularity amongst many who never read a page of the *Enquiry concerning Human Understanding*, but who believe with Strauss that Hume's reasoning "carries with it such conviction that the question may be regarded as having been by it virtually

settled". The famous argument may be best stated in its author's epigrammatic words: "A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined. . . . It is no miracle that a man, seemingly in good health, should die on a sudden, because such a kind of death, though more unusual than any other, has yet been frequently observed to happen. But it is a miracle that a dead man should come to life, because that has never been observed in any age or country. . . . The consequence is that no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavors to establish. Or, briefly, it is contrary to experience that a miracle should be true, but not contrary to experience that testimony should be false."

Now when this argument is scrutinized, it is found, like so many other arguments that play havoc with untrained minds, to be much more specious than formidable. Indeed, it turns out to be nothing more nor less than a fallacy which boldly assumes the very thing to be proved. For a miracle, like any other issue of fact, is a matter of evidence. Whether an event took place or did not take place can be determined in one way, and in one way only, namely, by means of testimony; and if there is any evidence in the world worth taking into account, surely it is that which bears on the works of Him "who was approved of God unto men by miracles and signs and wonders which God did by Him in the midst of them". Of that evidence, telling how, in a supreme moment of history, the blind saw and the lame walked and the lepers were cleansed and the dead were raised, Hume takes no cognizance whatever. He puts it out of court by an adroit appeal to the "firm and unalterable experience" that has established the laws of nature, of which laws he pronounces a miracle to be a violation. He takes no more notice of the positive evidence for miracles than if it never existed: when it is question of raising a man from the dead, he thinks it enough to say that such a thing "has never been observed in any age or country". Accustomed though we are to all kinds of reckless attacks on

miracles, we must always view with fresh wonder this audacious mode of disposing of them and of a body of evidence which has brought about the greatest movement the world has ever known. It is not a matter of surprise that such a rough-and-ready method of arguing should provoke protests from men who, like John Stuart Mill and Huxley, were in no wise shocked by Hume's lack of orthodoxy but were scandalized by his lack of logic. Mill [1] pointed out that "the argument has the appearance of assuming that the testimony of experience against miracles is undeviating and indubitable . . . whereas the very thing asserted on the other side is that there have been miracles, and that the testimony of experience is not wholly on the negative side. All evidence alleged in favor of any miracle ought to be reckoned as counter-evidence in refutation of the ground on which it is asserted that miracles ought to be disbelieved." Similarly Huxley confessed that "the question as to what Jesus actually said and did is capable of solution by no other methods than those practised by the historian and literary critic". Hume stands convicted of the most daring attempt known in the history of controversy to assume the conclusion which he set out to establish.

And this is not all. Hume, it may be further observed, deals with miracles only in the abstract. He approaches them from the point of view of nature's laws, presenting them primarily as violations of those laws, and making of them vagrant wonders, sadly out of place in a world of immutable and irreversible order. Now, a miracle is a work wrought by Divine power for a Divine purpose by means beyond the reach of man. From the very nature of the case miracles must be discussed in the light of God's existence; and once the existence of a Supreme Being is established—once we grant that nature is God's nature and nature's laws God's laws—the possibility of a new effect above and beyond the reach of nature's forces cannot be called in question. To those who would post "No thoroughfare", the words which Dante put on Vergil's lips when Minos blocked their way, would be explanation enough: "thus is it willed there where is power to do that which is willed, and asks no more"—

[1] See his *Three Essays on Religion*. for an acute analysis of Hume's argument.

Vuolsi così colà dove si puote
Ciò che si vuole; e piu non dimandare.[2]

All this Mill saw clearly. "Once admit a God," he wrote, "and the production by His direct volition of an effect which in any case owed its origin to His creative Will is no longer a purely arbitrary hypothesis, but must be reckoned with as a serious possibility. The question then changes its character, and the decision of it must now rest upon what is known as to the manner of God's government of the universe."

And as Hume studiously avoids all reference to God, so also does he carefully shun all reference to Christ, against whose miracles his shafts are covertly aimed. How unfair to the cause of miracles this whole mode of procedure is, and how unjust to the cause of the Gospel miracles, in particular, needs no proof. When the miracles of our Lord are viewed in connexion with the Incarnation, with the claims He made, with the character of the works He performed, with the message He brought—for as Pascal well says, "miracles are the test of doctrine and doctrine is the test of miracles"—they come to us not only with testimony, but also with probability in their favor. If miracles be viewed in their true perspective, in the vast context of Christianity, they bring their own evidence with them.

Such was the famous piece of reasoning, a model of what an argument should not be, which was to put an end forever to the discussion of miracles. Hume prophesied that "it would be useful as long as the world endures"! It still retains its charm for unconscious Humes, not because it can boast of a vestige of cogency, but because the psychological atmosphere of our times predisposes minds to acquiesce in it, and because science seems to have given a more solid basis to the uniformity of nature on which it depends. Now, as it is a common charge made against miracles that they contravene the laws of nature—laws that are regarded with superstitious reverence—it will be well to inquire what is meant by these laws and by the uniformity of nature of which they are the formularies. Much of the current misconception concerning miracles arises from hazy notions on these points.

[2] Inferno. V, 23, 24.

It is a law of nature that every body attracts every other body with a force that varies directly as the product of the masses of the two bodies, and inversely as the square of the distance between them. This, nature's widest law, we call the law of gravitation. On analysis it is found to be simply a formula which expresses the mode according to which material bodies act on one another. It sums up in a convenient generalization our knowledge concerning the most common phenomenon of nature. *Why* bodies act in this fashion, the law does not pretend to set forth—it is only a concise statement of *what takes place*. Similarly, it is a law of nature that water freezes at 32° F.; but here, again, we have only a record of our experience—a convenient summary of our information concerning one of the most familiar phenomena of nature. So it is with every other law of nature: it is found to be a formula, pure and simple; and a formula has no existence outside the mind. "A law of nature," said Professor Poynting, "explains nothing; it has no governing power; it is but a descriptive formula which the careless have sometimes personalized." [3]

Here lies the error of those who reject miracles as transgressions of the laws of nature: they hypostatize these laws, making of them not formulas and generalizations, but causes and forces which bind the world fast in fate. Laws, however, are not causes—"the rules of navigation never steered a ship, and the law of gravitation never moved a planet". The definition of miracle, then, as a violation of the laws of nature is meaningless; but, unfortunately for the cause of truth, is one of those false definitions which leave disastrous consequences in their train.

The "uniformity of nature" is a kindred term which also constitutes a stumbling-block. The conception of uniformity is by no means a discovery of modern science. Seventeen hundred years ago Alexander Aphrodisias, a commentator on Aristotle, formulated it with a precision that would satisfy a professor of science in our own day: "Everything that happens is followed by something else with which it is necessarily linked as cause, and is preceded by something which is linked

[3] Address, *British Association*, 1889.

with it as its cause. For nothing in the world exists or happens without a cause, since there is nothing in it which is loose and separate from all preceding causes." Everything that comes to be is caused, and the same causes operating in the same circumstances produce like results. In the inorganic world this uniformity of nature is most easily perceived. There the first great triumphs of science were achieved; there were brought to light the great syntheses, the law of gravitation, the law of the indestructibility of matter, the law of the conservation of energy, etc., to which science points with so much exultation. It has been the dream of science to bring the other realms of nature under subjection to law capable of mathematical expression. Of this Huxley made no secret. "If there is one thing clear about the progress of modern science, it is the tendency to reduce all scientific problems except those which are purely mathematical to questions of molecular physics." [4] "The progress of science means the extension of the province of what we call matter and causation and the gradual concomitant banishment from all regions of human thought of what we call spirit and spontaneity." [5] Sooner or later, he averred, we should arrive at a mechanical equivalent of consciousness as we arrived at a mechanical equivalent of heat. Evolution was to be the means by which this dream was to become a reality — a principle by which the entire course of phenomena throughout the universe was to be interpreted. Given the raw materials of the universe, and the process of evolution from which nothing is exempt, it would have been possible for an intelligence of sufficient power to make a forecast of every occurrence even in the far-off days when

> The solid earth on which we tread
> In tracts of fluent heat began.

In Häckel's eyes this constituted the "inestimable value" of Evolution—that it rendered possible the formation of a purely mechanistic explanation of the world. Du Bois Raymond boasted that "the universal process of the world might be represented by a single mathematical formula". This was mechanism run mad, but it has been the gruesome hope and

[4] *Lay Sermons*, p. 166.

[5] Ibid., p. 142.

inspiration animating all the false prophets of science in their work.

Thus did the uniformity of nature become a fearful doctrine of scientific fatalism, accounting for all phenomena of mind and matter by an iron law of causation; excluding every attempt at a spiritual interpretation of nature; leaving no room for intelligence behind the physical order; "banishing spirit and spontaneity from all regions of human thought."

Of late years the trend of science has undeniably set against the extension of mechanism beyond the frontiers of inorganic nature. True, the theory that an organism is a machine, and that its processes may be explained by chemistry and physics, still survives in text-books of physiology; but as an adequate explanation of life and life's activities it has been surrendered by men who have earned the right to speak with highest authority on the subject. Foremost among them is Dr. Hans Driesch, who has "given deeper thought to the problem of development than anyone since the days of Aristotle". His testimony derives peculiar force and interest from the fact that in days gone by he was an ardent advocate of mechanism, and that the series of experiments in embryology which won him world-wide renown was the means of weaning him from the theory of his earlier predilection. That view he now stigmatizes as "an uncritical dogmatism of a materialistic mode of thought". Dr. J. S. Haldane, of Oxford, has recently subjected mechanism to a searching analysis, and does not mince his words to express his contempt for it: "I should as soon go back to the mythology of our Saxon forefathers as to the mechanistic physiology."[6] In Europe, among the younger generation of biologists, destructive criticism of the older physiology is cropping up on all sides. Bunge, Neumeister, Kassowitz, Wolff, Wiesner, Borodin, Reinke, are only a few of those who have weighed the theory and found it wanting.[7] Among philosophers, likewise, evidence is not lacking that mechanism has seen its best days. The crushing criticism of it by Bergson[8] and the trenchant analysis of it by Mr. Balfour

[6] *Mechanism, Life and Personality*, p. 61.

[7] For an account of this remarkable reaction, see Otto: *Naturalism and Religion*, Chap. IX.

[8] *Creative Evolution*, Chap. I.

in his latest work [9] are classic contributions to the literature of the subject, destined, surely, to exercise a decisive influence particularly among those who can move in the higher reaches of thought.

As to the attempts made to explain mind and its processes by means of mechanical theories, there is little to be gained by discussing such whimsical adventures in psychology. When we are asked to believe that we are essentially nervous machines "with an appendage of consciousness", or that consciousness is a by-product of brain processes — like a spark thrown off by an engine or foam flung up by a wave—or that mental states have no agency of their own, no power to react upon the organism in which they exist, we feel the matter must be left to the common sense of the world. To those who maintain that our conduct is determined solely by physical processes in which the mind has no part, we are tempted to say, "You cannot indict humanity at large".

As we look out over the whole field of this great controversy it must seem to us that the fog is lifting. It is like the melting of a mist to watchers on a mountain. Pantheism, with its majestic world process, does not satisfy the demands of the mind and heart — "magnificent but not philosophy," is the epitaph on its tomb. Any system of thought that calls upon us to abdicate our individuality and resign our freedom of will is subversive of the surest intuitions of our nature, and is fighting against the common sense of the world. Deism, with its policy of non-intervention, never was a really serious issue. Materialism will doubtless continue to be the ready refuge of the unreflecting — "men have their philosophy but are not philosophers"; but all who are capable of following the analysis of a world-view will say with Mr. Balfour: "We know too much about matter to be materialists". As to science and its sacrosanct dogma of the uniformity of nature, "the pavement is up in all directions". On all sides there are symptoms of revolt against the simple and sweeping reasoning that would cabin, crib, confine the universe in formulas, and leave nothing in heaven and earth unexplored and unexplained. Science alone cannot carry

[9] *Theism and Humanism*, Lecture VIII.

> The heavy and the weary weight
> Of all this unintelligible world.

Nature, indeed, *is* uniform; but this simply means that nature is rational; it does not mean that nature is a closed system of forces, self-existent, self-sustaining, governed by irreversible laws and banning from its confines life and mind and will and purpose and personality in the true sense of these terms. Mechanistic Evolution—the only form of evolution with which most people have been familiar—is steadily falling into disrepute. Mr. Bateson did not hesitate to say in his Presidential Address before the British Association in 1914: "We go to Darwin for his incomparable collection of facts, we would fain emulate his scholarship, his width and his power of exposition, but to us he speaks no more with philosophic authority; we read his scheme of Evolution as we would those of Lucretius or of Lamarck, delighting in their simplicity and courage." The world has grown weary of the science that attempted to interpret all nature mechanically. The words of Sir Oliver Lodge voice the new feeling among leaders of scientific thought in our day: "It is my function to remind you and myself that our studies do not exhaust the universe, and that if we dogmatize in a negative direction and say that we can reduce everything to physics and chemistry, we gibbet ourselves as ludicrously narrow pedants, and are falling short of the richness and fulness of our human birthright." [10]

And while protests are rising against the crude science which we inherited from the last century, there is a growing consciousness of the vast import of miracles, not simply because of the direct and fundamental proof of Christian Revelation they afford, but also because of their bearing on wider questions which all the ages ask. "Is this world to be construed on a spiritual basis?" "Is nature a vast mechanism in which we are only cogs, or is it the work of One who called it into being and 'who upholdeth all things by the word of His power'?" On such questions miracles shed light that broadens as we look—like the band of moonlight that broadens as we follow its path over the waters. In the Christian doctrine of miracles a world of truth is gathered up and unified. As we ponder it, we cannot help recalling the splendid figure in the

[10] *Continuity*, p. 93.

Areopagitica where Milton tells how truth was torn to pieces and her members scattered to the winds, and how those who loved her, like Isis seeking for the body of Osiris, sought to gather the scattered parts and combine them once more into a perfect whole.

HUMPHREY MOYNIHAN.

College of St. Thomas,
St. Paul, Minnesota.

SOME COUNTRY PARISHES.

RECENTLY there was an animated controversy in the pages of this REVIEW on the relative effects of town and country life on Catholicity. This paper is not a contribution on the above question: its aim is to steer clear of controversy. It proposes to deal with Catholicity in the country exclusively under one aspect.

Perhaps the ideal surroundings for Catholicity is a town of certain size, say with a population of from 1000 to 2000, the Catholics in the town and the surrounding country forming a good-sized congregation, representing some thirty or more per cent of the population, and having a resident pastor, or, better still, a pastor and an assistant, and perhaps a school. Splendid results are obtained in such cases. A healthy, virile type of Catholicity is developed. With a priest or two priests in their midst the leakage amongst Catholics is reduced to a minimum, and converts more than fill the benches left vacant by those who have fallen away: the children are instructed, and the Sacraments are frequented. Catholicity is a living force in that neighborhood. The dangers and temptations of city life are absent. The moral atmosphere of a town where professional men, such as doctors, bankers, merchants, tradesmen, and retired farmers live, and, having a modest competency, feel entitled to take their ease, and want to be near the church in their old age, is superior to many country districts.

But what of the Catholics who live in the country where they form only five, eight, ten, or twelve per cent of the population; where the town is only of moderate size, under two or three hundred; where there is no resident priest, nor any keen desire on the part of the Catholics to have one; where Mass is

said occasionally on weekdays, or perhaps on Sundays just a few times a year? Can any one acquainted with such surroundings feel aught but pity for the lot of Catholics who find themselves so circumstanced, and for the children reared in such an atmosphere? There are many Catholics so situated. Their lot is not an enviable one, as I know from experience, having said the first Sunday Mass in more towns than one.

Who are those Catholics? Pioneers, settlers on the prairie and in the backwoods, laborers more or less migratory, men in business in the new towns that are continually springing up. When the land is acquired by settlement or purchase, there is some talk of a railway. It may be long before it is built, and then it may follow another route. There are settlers living here and there who have been accustomed for years to haul their grain sixty, even eighty miles; others carry provisions in packs on their backs, and tramp thirty or forty miles over a forest trail. Sometimes purely Catholic settlements have been made; more frequently Catholics have settled at random. When they realize their surroundings, they find themselves five, eight, or a dozen Catholic families swallowed up amongst a crowd of people who in the main have no definite religious belief, the dull uniformity of indifference being broken by a Baptist church, a Methodist, a Lutheran, a Presbyterian, or an Adventist. Their neighbors know next to nothing about Catholicity. Very often they are hostile to it. Let a person without any religion become an Episcopalian, a Methodist, a Presbyterian, and nothing is said; but let it be only rumored that some one is becoming a Catholic, and within a week there will be callers coming and asking:—"What? Are *you* thinking of becoming a Catholic?" These persons derive their knowledge of Catholicity from professedly anti-Catholic papers; they greedily devour these sheets, and swallow everything they read.

Let me take a case in point. A Catholic lives out in the backwoods, fourteen miles from the nearest Catholic church. There is a road being built now, but for years past the journeying through the wilds to make one's Easter duty was the highest achievement of the three Catholic families and the two Catholic settlers in that neighborhood. The head of one

family keeps the local postoffice. The bulk of the mail is very often *The Menace.* The recipients sit round in the postoffice, and read *The Menace* at the postmaster. Just fancy! there are young children, three families, growing up under these daily surroundings.

Of course settlers such as those described are not the very best type of Catholics. If they were, they would have made careful inquiries about the neighborhood in which they proposed to settle. They would have asked whether there was a resident priest, or at least whether there was a church, and how often Mass is said. A business man some time ago told me that several Catholics, prospective buyers of land, had written to him about farms that were for sale in his neighborhood, inquiring about the price per acre, the quality of the soil, and whether a Catholic church existed in the district. When he had to reply that there was no church nor any immediate prospect of one, there was no answer. These farmers were good Catholics, more than likely men with families, who won't settle where their children will grow up without instruction, and without the opportunity of leading a practical Catholic life.

The following incident was recently told me. A man bought land cheaply near a town where there was no church. He proposed to go and live there with his family. His home was near a flourishing Catholic church. His wife asked him: "Is there a Catholic church where you're going?" "No." "Then you may go yourself, but I and the children stay here." They all stayed. The demand, on the part of Catholics, to have a church near their settlement is so well known, so universally admitted, that for purely business reasons non-Catholics will contribute to the building of a Catholic church in districts that are being settled. They will tell you freely that a Catholic church is a good thing for business in a town, and that it sends the price of land up, and makes it more marketable.

But the Catholics whose main idea is to make a living, whose chief aim is success in this life, and who are scattered in small towns or in the country, a miserable minority of the population, are still to be reckoned with. They are not the most promising material; still, having been baptized, they are Catholics. Our Saviour died for them as well as for those who have churches, schools, priests. What of them?

If they are to be blamed, they are also to be pitied because of the depressing and dangerous situation they are in. There is serious leakage in the Church from that source. Get half a dozen priests together who deal with people of the type mentioned, and listen to their stories. They will all tell of mixed marriages, of the children of many such marriages lost to the faith, of dreadful ignorance, of greed, of utter indifference to God and the things of God.

A priest, my near neighbor who lives only about a hundred miles away, said to me recently: "I was lately down in the Red Oak settlement, twenty miles from the railway, out in the forest. The people there had not seen a priest since they had settled in the place, which was a good many years ago. A woman answered my suggestion about having the priest come frequently by: 'Father, when we came here first, it was dreadful to be without Mass on Sundays, but now we have almost got so that we don't care!'"

In another place I found fourteen Catholic families within the area of a small town and the surrounding country. They had had Mass once a month on a weekday for years. When at length Mass was announced for Sunday there were only two families in attendance, that is to say, fifteen per cent; while eighty-five per cent stayed away. To complete the story, the father of one of the families stated that he didn't believe in Confession, but he liked his wife and children to go to Mass, and he went with them.

Another mission, a small town with its surrounding district, was served from a parish thirteen miles away. There was a decent church in the town, and a fair-sized congregation, the bulk of them in easy circumstances. For a dozen years they had a weekday Mass once a month. Finally the bishop sent them a priest, but one of the trustees told the priest they didn't want him: the old style was good enough for them.

Sometimes, as in the above case, the priest at the outset encounters hostility. A weekday Mass is tolerable: people don't have to go. But a resident priest with Sunday Mass imposes an obligation. They are expected to come, and absence creates uncomfortable inquiry. Where the priest visits only on weekdays the attendance is usually poor. Some of the men have got to work, and cannot come. The children may come, and

then they may not. The school is a counter attraction. Most of the women will come. But for all that, it is go as you please; there is no question of obligation. Many consider themselves good Catholics when they have done their Easter duty, though they may rarely, or never, at other times enter the church. In these cases the Word of God can hardly be said to reach those Catholic families as a whole. The children cannot be properly instructed. A priest seeing children once only a month can do very little. Unless the parents are particularly careful, or some local person, capable of instructing the children, offers to do so, they are apt to be lost to the Church.

A marked difficulty, almost invariably met with in people of this class, is their attachment to money. They were admittedly poor when they started in life. Some of them are no better off now; others have a competence; and a few are wealthy as the neighborhood goes. Time was when they had to be saving of necessity; now the old habit perseveres. As a result they have no money for the support of church or school.

All this begets indifference to the things of God. Their spiritual destitution does not impress them, and they often become a hindrance to the progress of religion around them. Thus, as the years pass, the people are becoming more indifferent; the children are growing up to be young men and women; the older people have forgotten some of what they knew when they were young, and what they remember has less and less influence on their lives. In short, the whole community is drifting farther and farther away from God. Mixed marriages, a thing of common occurrence, add to the evil. Ignorance of the laws of the Church concerning marriage and indifference to those laws constantly increase the number of invalid marriages among such people. A vague idea that marriage should be performed by a priest keeps up some tie between them and the Church; where this is wanting, religion is frequently given up altogether, and the children are almost invariably lost.

What can be done for such people? A charitable priest travels, often long distances, to say Mass for them on week-days. He gives them opportunities of approaching the Sacraments: the children, the bulk of them at least, after some kind

of preparation make their First Communion. But the results are not satisfactory. There remain dreadful, appalling ignorance and indifference, loss of faith in many cases. The only remedy to lessen these evils in some degree is an increase in the number of priests, more Sunday Masses, more instruction, more opportunities to lead a normal Catholic life.

The priest who ministers to such people need not expect a home; he cannot count on getting even his living and traveling expenses. In some cases the people may be able to supply them; but in many cases they are unwilling. The priest has got to be independent of the people, at least until they realize the obligation adequately to support religion. Meanwhile the only way to save these people from their ignorance and indifference is to have one, two, or three priests, supported from a diocesan fund, to visit the Catholic settlements scattered over the diocese. The support of such missions will not come in its entirety from the people to whom we minister. It must come from the old, well-established congregations. If the missionary spirit be kindled, good results would no doubt be obtained. Here, it must be admitted, we Catholics linger behind other religious denominations. Most Protestant denominations have their missionary funds; they find means to build churches for actual or possible adherents; they support, wholly or in part, ministers in pioneer towns. They have their traveling evangelists, their revivals. In the town in which I live and labor, the Methodists were the first to build a church, the Presbyterians second, and the Catholic church is only now being completed. We were ten years behind the Presbyterians, because the people were unable to support a priest. Yet it was much easier to build five or six years ago than it is now.

There is an old, well-established town not so very far from here. It is a county-seat. It has a population of about 1000, and there are all sorts of churches. Only a month ago was the Catholic church dedicated and the Sacrament of Confirmation was administered for the first time. A good-sized church was packed, and although a third of the congregation were non-Catholics, I fancy they might have been Catholics if a church had been built earlier.

Another town visited by me some months ago has had Sunday and a weekday Mass at irregular intervals. My stated

visits continued for a few months, till I was transferred elsewhere. In that short time the congregation notably increased. After Mass somebody remarked that we had a good attendance. "Father," remarked one of the teachers who happened to be a Catholic, "if all were there, we should have had as many more." The figures were gone into, and the estimate was found to be correct. In that town there is a resident Presbyterian minister who draws thirty dollars a month from the Missionary Board. There is no Catholic endowment whatsoever, nor have the Catholics got help from any outside source.

But why labor the point? Anyone who has traveled along those branch lines that lead nowhere, and stopped and seen the little towns scattered along the way, will see churches indeed, but not always a Catholic church. He will hear of revivalists, missionaries, traveling lecturers sent out by various denominations, but no record of a Catholic mission in any town but the very largest, where there is a church and a resident priest.

There is one Catholic organization in the field already—the Catholic Church Extension Society of Chicago. But the Extension Society is principally concerned with building churches, and furnishing them with vestments, chalices, and altars. True, it has Chapel Cars; but so far as the writer knows, it does not help to support priests to minister in certain specified towns. After all, it is not enough always to build a church and furnish it; there still remains the question of the priest to visit that church regularly, say Mass, instruct the people, and prepare them for the intelligent and fruitful reception of the Sacraments. And here it seems to me that diocesan or provincial societies might make a fruitful effort to help the Catholic cause. Perhaps the Extension Society will eventually increase its activities, and in dioceses where the need exists, place itself in communication with the bishops and through them arrange for the partial or total maintenance of priests to minister to the churches which the Society has built and furnished. Really it does not matter how the thing is done, provided it is done. Undoubtedly the need exists. What splendid results would be obtained if only American Catholics were informed of the spiritual destitution

of many of their scattered brethren, and could be induced to minister to them! The missionary spirit would be kindled in our Catholics for the spiritual benefit of their immediate neighbors. Priests would thus be enabled to hunt up scattered Catholics, and give them opportunities to practise their religion. The present leakage would in a great measure be stopped. Experience proves that results are obtained from Sunday Mass that are entirely out of the question when a community has only a weekday Mass. And in many cases the visiting missionary would give place to the resident pastor. Thus would be accomplished the work of a priest seeking after that which is gone astray and lost. It is surely work for the faithful to help him to do so. VIATOR.

Analecta

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV.

QUAEDAM AD SS. COR IESU ORATIO INDULGENTIA DITATUR.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam. — Nihil tam aptum tamque idoneum esse arbitramur ad Deum hominibus, praesertim in rebus trepidis, conciliandum, quam Sacratissimum Cor Iesu enixis implorare precibus, ut pro infinita sua clementia nostri misereatur. Neque aliud sane opportunius utiliusque videtur; Sacrum enim Cor Christi Iesu fons et sedes incensi illius est amoris, qui eum Divinum Redemptorem ad Crucis mortem pro nobis oppetendam adduxit, tum constans perfugium manet, quo humanum genus se recipiat, et ubi penitus acquiescat. Quod si hunc caritatis ignem, qui in Christi Corde sempiternus ardet, fideles studiose conciperent, Deum pro viribus amarent, atque inter se diligerent. Quae cum ita sint, insequentem Nobis exhibitam precationem Apostolica Auctoritate ratam hisce Litteris habemus, eamque post auditos VV. FF. NN. S. R. E. Cardinales Inquisitores Generales, caelestibus Ecclesiae thesauris, quorum Altissimus Nos dispensatores esse voluit, libenti quidem animo locupletamus. Quare omnibus ac singulis ex utroque sexu Christifidelibus, qui ubique gentium eandem, quae subiicitur, precem, et cuius exemplar in tabulario Brevium Apostolicorum asservari iubemus, corde saltem contriti, quo-

libet idiomate, dummodo versio sit fidelis, recitaverint, quoties id egerint, centum dies de iniunctis eis, seu alias quomodolibet debitis poenitentiis in forma Ecclesiae consueta relaxamus. Quam indulgentiam etiam animabus in purgatorio igne detentis quae, Deo caritate coniunctae, ab hac luce migraverint, per modum suffragii applicari posse impertimus. Volumus autem ut praesentium Litterarum transumptis, seu exemplis etiam impressis, manu alicuius Notarii publici subscriptis ac sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis, eadem prorsus fides adhibeatur, quae adhiberetur ipsis praesentibus si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Praesentibus perpetuo valituris. In contrarium facientibus non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Preghiera al Sacro Cuore di Gesù.

" O Cuore Santissimo di Gesù O fonte di ogni bene! Io vi adoro, vi amo, e pentito vivamente dei peccati miei, vi presento questo mio povero cuore. Rendetelo umile, paziente, puro e in tutto conforme ai desideri vostri. Fate, o buon Gesù, che io viva in voi e per voi. Proteggetemi nei pericoli, consolatemi nelle afflizioni, concedetemi la sanità del corpo, soccorso nei miei bisogni temporali, la vostra benedizione in tutte le mie opere, e la grazia di una santa morte." [1]

Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die IV decembris anno MCMXV, Pontificatus Nostri secundo.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status.*

L. * S.

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM.

DECRETUM CIRCA PRECES IN FINE MISSAE RECITANDAS.

Quum in aliquibus locis et Dioecesibus dubium exortum sit: Utrum preces in fine Missae a Summo Pontifice Leone XIII praescriptae, adhuc sint recitandae, Sacra Rituum Congregatio

[1] O Most Holy Heart of Jesus! Fountain of all good! I adore Thee, I love Thee, and being deeply sorry for my sins, I offer Thee this my poor heart. Make it humble, patient, pure, and in all things conformed to Thy desires. Grant, O good Jesus, that I may live in and for Thee. Protect me in dangers, console me in affliction, give to me health of body, assistance in my temporal needs, Thy blessing in all my undertakings, and the grace of a holy death.

respondendum censuit: Affirmative, servatis decretis et normis ab ipsa Sacra Congregatione traditis.

Atque ita rescripsit, declaravit et approbante Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Benedicto Papa XV, servari mandavit.

Die 24 novembris 1915.

A. Card. Vico, *S. R. C. Pro-Praefectus.*

L. * S.

Alexander Verde, *Secretarius.*

SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA.

Declaratio.

S. Poenitentiaria ad dubitationes et controversias solvendas, quae apud nonnullos exortae sunt circa facultates ab eodem S. Tribunali, durante hoc bello, concessas Decretis diebus 18 decembris anni 1914, et 11 martii huius anni datis, adprobante Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Benedicto PP. XV, declarat praedictas facultates in illis locis territorii bellici (vulgo *zona di guerra*) tantummodo adhiberi posse, in quibus difficile sit fidelibus pro sacramentali confessione peragenda recurrere ad sacerdotes adprobatos a locorum Ordinariis, simulque sacerdotibus ad exercitum pertinentibus eosdem Ordinarios adire ad adprobationem obtinendam pro eorumdem fidelium confessione recipienda.

Datum Romae, in Sacra Poenitentiaria, die 4 decembris 1915.

Gulielmus Card. Van Rossum, *Poen. Maior.*

L. * S.

I. Palica, *S. P. Secretarius.*

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII.

(Sectio de Indulgentiis)

Decretum: Pium Exercitium xv Feriarum Tertiarum in honorem S. Dominici Conf. quocumque anni tempore peragi potest.

Die 25 novembris 1915.

Ssmus D. N. D. Benedictus div. prov. Pp. XV, in audientia R. P. D. Adsessori S. Officii impertita, benigna concedere dig-

natus est, ut indulgentiae tributae per Decretum d. d. 6 maii 1915 christifidelibus qui piis interfuerint exercitationibus ac supplicationibus in honorem S. Dominici Conf. per quindecim ferias tertias continuas festum eiusdem Sancti immediate antecedentes, acquiri possint quocumque anni tempore, semel tamen infra annum, firmis remanentibus de cetero conditionibus et clausulis memorati Decreti. Praesenti in perpetuum valituro, absque ulla Brevis expeditione. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *Secretarius.*

L. * S.

✠ DONATUS, Archiep. Ephesin., *Adsessor S. O.*

ROMAN CURIA.

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS.

7 October, 1915: Mgr. Michael F. FitzSimmons, of the archdiocese of Chicago, made Protonotary Apostolic "ad instar participantium".

7 October: Mgr. Louis F. Thiele, of the archdiocese of Chicago, made Domestic Prelate.

4 December: Mgr. Joseph Delaney, of the Diocese of Albany, made Domestic Prelate.

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

POPE BENEDICT XV attaches indulgences to the recitation of a certain prayer to the Sacred Heart. The text of the prayer is given.

S. CONGREGATION OF RITES decrees that the prayers ordered by Pope Leo XIII to be recited after Low Mass are still to be said.

S. APOSTOLIC POENITENTIARY declares that the faculties given by it to military chaplains, during the war, for the hearing of confessions, are available only in the war zones where it is difficult for the people to make their confessions to priests approved by the local Ordinary, or for the confessors to obtain permission to hear confessions from the local Ordinary.

S. CONGREGATION OF HOLY OFFICE announces that the indulgences that are granted to those who attend the devotions in honor of St. Dominic on the fifteen Tuesdays immediately preceding the Saint's feast, may also be gained at any time during the year, though only once within the twelvemonth, and provided otherwise the conditions of the decree of 6 May, 1915, are observed.

THE MORAL SIDE OF THE BOLLINGER BABY CASE.

So many contradictory statements have been made in the daily press about the chief actors in the recent case of the Bollinger Baby that we are thankful for the facts given us by Father Spalding in the January number of the REVIEW. These are briefly: (1) that the doctor, knowing that a simple operation would prolong the life of the child, with the consent of the mother failed to perform it because he was convinced the child would be permanently defective, both physically and mentally; (2) that a board of physicians, appointed to examine into the case, unanimously declared that " a prompt operation would have prolonged and perhaps saved the life of the child, and that the physical defects gave no evidence

that the child would have become mentally or morally defective".

The moral issues involved have given rise to so much speculation in the secular and religious press that it might be well to supplement the remarks of Father Spalding by the following reflections.

The Church has ever been the defender of human life. Her moral teaching on this subject has found expression in the Declaration of American Independence, according to which "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness". It is American, therefore, as well as Catholic, to hold that with respect to life all men are equal, whether they be young or old, rich or poor, well formed or maimed, sane or insane, and that this right is inalienable, that is, that no man may forfeit it. In other words, life is a gift of God, and He alone may take it back. God alone has the power of life and death. "See ye that I alone am, and there is no other god besides me; I will kill and I will make alive." The crippled child is moulded by the hand of God as well as the most robust heir of humanity. It is destined to a supernatural end, of which its earthly existence is the forerunner. God put it in this world for His own wise ends, and no man has a right to decide whether or not it shall remain. "The Lord giveth, the Lord taketh away." It is only, therefore, by taking into account the spiritual as well as the material side of human life that a satisfactory answer to the questions raised by the case of the Chicago baby can be obtained. This, in brief, is the teaching of the Catholic Church.

What obligations follow from it? First, no man may take his own life. He is a sentinel placed on guard by the Great Commander, and he may not leave his post until relieved by the same authority that put him there. To do so would be cowardice and treason. Secondly, every man is bound to use all ordinary means to preserve his life. Wilfully to deprive oneself of sufficient food to sustain life is suicide. The refusal to accept the ordinary remedies in sickness is also unlawful. A man may endanger his life when there is a sufficient reason for it. The father of a family may engage in a dangerous

occupation in order to obtain a livelihood. The captain of a sinking ship may and should make provision for the safety of his passengers even at the risk of his own life. In other words, a person may place an act having two effects, one good and the other evil, provided the good effect is chiefly intended and there exists a grave cause for placing the act.

What one must do to preserve his own life, that he must also do to preserve the lives of those under his care. Hence parents and guardians must take the ordinary means to preserve the lives of children committed to them, all the more when these are incapable of acting for themselves. But what about extraordinary means? Are we obliged to have recourse to these when life is in danger? For example, are we obliged in case of a dangerous malady to submit to a critical operation when there is only a possibility of a cure? The answer is, No. The patient is free to choose. The reason is obvious. Patients often die under such operations; the cure is not certain; the surgeon only hopes for the recovery of the patient. Hence, the sick person is free to decide for or against the operation.

But when the operation is slight and accompanied by little danger or suffering, it can no longer be called extraordinary. In such a case the patient, to save his life, should submit to the operation. In similar circumstances he should secure the same for those under his care. In these days of anesthetics, delicate instruments, and accurate knowledge of the human system, surgery has reduced to a minimum the pain and the danger that attended operations in the past. It would seem, therefore, that in many cases the operation ceases to be extraordinary and merits to be classed among the ordinary means of regaining health.

Thirdly, no man may take away another's life—except to preserve his own, as in the case of an attack from a would-be assassin, or as in the case of capital punishment, which the State has received the power from God to inflict for its own defence. The same may be said of a war which the State declares in order to protect its just rights. But no man may place an act whose direct effect would be to take the life of the innocent. This would be murder, pure and simple.

Now, in the light of these principles, what is to be thought of the action of the mother and the doctor in the now famous

Bollinger baby case? Waiving the question of their personal guilt, which depends on the state of their consciences more or less enlightened, the act of the mother and doctor, considered in itself, was certainly a grievous violation of the rights of the child. It is no palliation of their guilt to say that they did not actually take the life of the child. The fact is, that they omitted to perform an act which would have saved the life of the child and which they were in duty bound to perform. By her office and by every instinct of nature the mother was obliged to use every ordinary means to preserve the life of her child, and the physician by his position of healer and by the ethics of his noble profession was in honor and conscience bound to do all in his power to save the life of the child. This he could have done, according to his own testimony, by performing a "simple operation". Instead, he assumed the rôle of headsman, and persuaded the mother to coöperate with him in taking the life of the innocent. The child's life was in possession and should have been given at least the benefit of the doubt. Whenever the rights of others are involved, especially the supreme right of life, the safer course must be followed.

What about the arguments advanced to justify the action of the mother and the doctor? If the child lived, said the doctor, it would be a defective, and thus a burden to itself and to society. The jury of physicians dissented from his conclusion. They declared that there was reasonable ground for hope that the child would not be completely crippled and that it would not be deprived of the use of its mental faculties. Where eminent physicians disagree on so vital a question, there is at least room for doubt. Hence the doctor was not justified in following a mere probable opinion. He was obliged to follow the safer course and perform the operation.

Besides, all defectives are not a burden to themselves and to society. Demosthenes, notwithstanding a defect of speech, which was generally considered incurable, became the greatest orator of Greece and the pride of his countrymen. Milton, though blind; Pope, though a weak, delicate child; Robert Louis Stevenson, though a consumptive, have won for themselves immortal places in English literature. Mary Merrick, of Ellicott City, Maryland, though bedridden for over twenty-five years, has founded and still personally directs the Christ

Child Society, through which support and instruction in the useful arts have been brought to thousands of indigent children in every large city of America. The child that died a short time ago might not have attained the distinction of these famous persons, but it should at least have been given a chance. No physician, no matter how well versed in the wisdom of eugenics, can foretell with certain knowledge who will be "fit" and who "unfit" to live.

Finally, let us suppose it were certain that the Bollinger baby would be permanently defective, both physically and mentally. Would the action of the mother and the physician be justified? Most emphatically, no. Granted that such a child would become a burden to society, I answer that this is a burden which society is obliged to assume. Society assumes this burden in the case of adults who are deformed or feeble-minded, and why should it be relieved of the burden in the case of helpless infants? Is not human life just as sacred in the child as in the grown man or woman? The surgeon in the war hospitals of Europe who would refuse to operate on a wounded soldier lest he should recover and thus become a burden to his country, would outrage public opinion. Shall the same public opinion hold him guiltless if he refuse to perform an operation that would save the life of a little child, even though society should be burdened thereby? To the thinking mind such inconsistency is inconceivable. Were such a distinction allowed to obtain lodgment in the public mind, the entering wedge of paganism would be securely driven into Christian consciences, which in time would tear asunder the whole warp and woof of our civilization.

The one thing that fundamentally differentiates Christianity from paganism is its attitude toward the individual. Paganism holds that the State is the only thing that has absolute or intrinsic value, that the individual derives his value from his relation to the State, that the State is to determine whether the individual shall be a benefit or a detriment to it, and take steps accordingly to protect itself. Hence we find in paganism parents throwing their deformed offspring to the dogs and wild beasts, or allowing them to die of cold and hunger. In modern Japan the physician quietly disposes of the "unfit", whether they be children or adults. How much like the

method of the modern eugenic school, of which the Chicago doctor is a type! Christianity, on the contrary, teaches that the individual is supreme, and that the only purpose of the State is to safeguard and defend the rights of the individual, chief among these being the "inalienable rights of life, liberty, and happiness". In pursuance of this fundamental doctrine of Christianity, Christian nations have regarded themselves as the servants of their subjects and have even gone to war to enforce reparation for injuries done to the humblest of their citizens. If the public condones the outrage committed against the sacred right of that little child in Chicago, what is going to become of our boasted civilization? How long will it be until the weak-minded, the deformed, the infirm, and the aged will be disposed of according to the same theory? Where is the line to be drawn, and who is to be the judge in this matter of life and death? Will defectives be allowed to die, or will recourse be had to cold-blooded murder? The fact that some eugenists have advocated this latter method shows the extremes to which men may go when the sacredness of human life is lost sight of.

✠ JOHN P. CARROLL, *Bishop of Helena.*

THE CATHOLIC POPULATION AND THE CATHOLIC DIRECTORY.

The annual publication of the *Catholic Directory* usually calls forth comments and criticisms of the accuracy of its statistics as far as the Catholic census and population of dioceses and of the United States are concerned.

There is no doubt that the figures of the *Directory* are several million short of the total Catholic population, and for this inaccuracy the *Directory* is not responsible. It is due chiefly to the difficulty of obtaining complete parish reports in nearly all dioceses and failure in some chanceries of thorough revision and correction of parish reports by comparison of the number of births, deaths, marriages, school children, and so forth, with the number of families and individuals given in the parish census. In the calculation of population by the number of baptisms, or the number of deaths, few dioceses in the United States can be taken as a whole. Each parish must be taken singly, for the reason that the birth rate of one parish

may be double the birth rate of the neighboring parish. The death rate will also vary according to the character of the people and the conditions in which they live and work. For example, the average birth rate of the State of Pennsylvania, twenty-five to every thousand, would not be a reliable basis of estimation of the Catholic population of a diocese like Pittsburgh, in which about two-fifths of the families have a birth rate more than twice as high as the average birth rate of the State.

Those who do not understand the racial and social conditions of two-fifths of the people of such a diocese are likely to over-estimate the Catholic population, taking the annual number of baptisms as the basis of computation. To calculate the number of souls in parishes composed of immigrants from Poland, Lithuania, Austria, Hungary, and Italy, many facts must be known and carefully considered. The birth rate in the countries from which these people come is the highest in Europe, and the various circumstances in which the immigrants are placed in the United States are most favorable to a high birth rate. Nearly all the married men and women are young, healthy, and guiltless of the iniquitous crimes of child-murder and race-suicide; and the number of children born in Slovak and Italian homes, for each one thousand of these people, is more than twice the number born in average American families. While many of the Catholic immigrants of recent years from Austria-Hungary, Russia, and Italy are single men, the absence of old families, the rule of early marriage, and the fact that nearly all the families that come to this country, or are formed here, are young and large, and that the number of unmarried young women is relatively small, establishes for them a new birth rate considerably higher than the birth rate of the countries from which the immigrants came; and far higher than the highest birth rate among any other class in the United States. In the Diocese of Pittsburgh the ordinary annual birth rate in the average American parish is one to each five or six families; the annual birth rate among the Slavs, Poles, and Italians often averages one to every two or two and a half families in the parish. The official census, as well as the city registration, of New York reveals the astounding fact that the Italian birth rate in New York City

for the year 1912 was 81 per 1,000 of the Italian population. Forty-six births to every one thousand of the population is the maximum reached in any part of Europe during recent years, and that figure is reached among the Poles. Throughout Russia the average is forty-three, and all the southeastern European States have maintained a much higher birth rate than other countries of Europe.

The most reliable statistics will show the higher birth rates of Europe nearly doubled in the new Slavonic and Italian families that are growing up in this country, and this is the result of the special and favorable conditions which have already been described.

In endeavoring to calculate the population of any people or class by the birth rate, the death rate must also be reckoned with. It is well known that, while the number of children born in families of our Italian and Slavic immigrants is large, the number of deaths in such families is sometimes correspondingly high, so that while the natural rate of increase of population among such people is considerably higher than the average increase for the country, it is not in all places so great as the number of births would lead us to believe. It can be estimated only by taking into account all the factors of births and deaths, the proportion of married and single persons in the population, and the circumstance that a number of the married immigrants and their children do not remain long in a diocese or in this country. However, anyone can realize the fallacy of estimating the population of a diocese on a basis of one thousand souls to every thirty baptisms when it should be one thousand to every seventy births for two-fifths of the population, and from thirty to forty births per thousand for the remainder. The most trustworthy parish reports show that the Diocese of Pittsburgh, taken as a whole, will average fifty births per thousasnd—that is, from twenty to twenty-two souls for each baptism; and this proportion will be about the standard for districts with similar composition of population, such as Philadelphia, Scranton, Altoona, and other dioceses.

If the census of every parish were made from house to house regularly and carefully, and all persons who profess to be Catholics were enumerated, whether contributors to collections or not, as is the practice of zealous pastors, the statistics of a

diocese could be given with almost scientific exactness, and the *Catholic Directory* would be as complete and accurate in the number of Catholics, and in all respects, as it is in the number of bishops, priests, religious communities, schools, and other institutions. There is no doubt that our parish records of the Catholic population fall far short of the reality on account of the infrequency and incompleteness of the parish census and the great yearly Catholic immigration and continuous movement of large numbers of people who do not reside long enough in one place to be known to the clergy and recorded as members of the parish.

To reach the exact number of people in a diocese like Pittsburgh each parish must be taken singly, or a certain average of birth rate and number of souls to a family must be ascertained for parishes belonging to certain groups. For instance, in old parishes where few new homes are being established there will be one baptism for every six or seven or even eight families, or for every thirty or thirty-five persons. In the ordinary groups of Catholic American families in growing and prosperous industrial centres there will be one baptism for every four or five families or for every twenty or twenty-five persons. In new parishes of the Italian and Slavonic groups, where there are no old families, there will be an average of one baptism to every two or three families, or for every twelve or fifteen persons.

The birth rate for the first group will be almost thirty per thousand, for the second it will be forty to fifty per thousand, and the third will average seventy births per thousand of the parish population. Hence different parishes will have different ratios of baptism to population, and the diocesan ratio may be any multiplier from fifteen to thirty persons for each baptism, according to the character and condition of the people.

Taking all these things into account, and making due allowance for them, we may conclude that, if all the families in the diocese of Pittsburgh which profess the Catholic faith and practise it, at least to the extent of having their children baptized, were put down in the parish census, the total Catholic population of the diocese would be set forth in the *Directory* as nearer six hundred thousand (600,000) than five hundred thousand.

What is true of this one diocese is true of many other places in the country, and that there are several million more baptized and professing Catholics in the United States than the *Catholic Directory* enumerates is held as certain by those who know aught of the various methods used in taking a parish census, and of the frequent incompleteness of the figures that are supplied to represent the number of families and souls in a congregation.

X. Y. Z.

SUPPORT OF POOR DIOCESAN MISSIONS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The Lenten suggestion of "Pastor Rusticus" in the February number of the REVIEW is certainly a timely one, for there is great need for money to take care of neglected Catholics in small places in every diocese in the country. In the diocese where I live there are, I dare say, about 10,000 families, who have not the services of a priest or any religious instruction, either through lack of means or, as in many cases, through more or less neglect. We have in the diocese a well-established Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, with one hundred or more teachers, who most generously give their time and energy every Sunday of the year to go into the neglected portions of the diocese to instruct the children in, at least, the rudiments of Christian Doctrine. There are about 2,000 children under the care of the Confraternity; but the work cannot progress as it should, because of lack of means to pay car fare and carriage hire in order to reach the secluded districts. We also have a Missionary Aid Society to which every parish contributes a certain percentage of its income. This fund is distributed to nearly every missionary cause in the country, except to missionary work in our own diocese. It seems, of course, that we are forgetting that charity should begin at home, and that he who has not care of his own, especially those of his own household, has denied the Faith and is worse than an infidel. The suggestion of "Pastor Rusticus", if carried into effect, would certainly add much to the efforts that are being made in many places to bring the knowledge of God to the neglected ones of the individual diocese.

PASTOR RUSTICUS NO. 2.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

PROPRIETY IN THE USE OF WORDS ONCE AGAIN.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Father Murphy is still bent on forcing upon my words a meaning which I not only did not intend but expressly and positively excluded. His method of doing so is peculiar. First of all, he garbles a statement of mine, omitting words that determine the precise meaning of it. When I interpose, and declare I made no such statement, he insists that if I did not make it I meant it, and that I do but quibble in affirming I did not. I can only repeat that I neither said nor meant that "the formal constituent principle of the human organism is multiple". What is more, I expressly repudiated the false doctrine embodied in that statement.

It is only one who is ignorant of the use of words who will maintain that "substantial form" and "formal constituent principle" are exact equivalents. In matter of fact, the latter of the two is generic, the former specific. This means that you may use the latter wherever you use the former, but not conversely. Thus, it is proper to say that the action of the priest who offers sacrifice is the formal constituent principle of the sacrifice, but not the substantial form. So, too, while authority is not, properly speaking, the substantial form of society, it is properly spoken of as the formal constituent principle, being the energizing factor that molds and governs it. From this we gather that the expression "formal constituent principle" admits of being used in an analogous sense. I am therefore justified in saying that each living cell has its own formal constituent principle, to wit, the principle which continues to energize in it after the rational soul is gone, as distinguished from the material element which remains even when all vital operation in it has ceased. And I have a right to resent the reiterated declaration that I maintain, nay "proclaim from the housetops", that "the substantial form, or formal constituent principle, of the human organism is multiple". Here, once more, are my very words: "I, on the other hand, have been dealing with the formal constituent principle of cells in the human organism, which I conceive to be multiple."

What I mean by saying that the rational soul is not the intrinsic constituent principle of each cell is plain enough from

the context. I say that "the rational soul is the formal constituent principle of the whole organism, and the ultimate principle of all life in the organism, though not the intrinsic constituent principle of each cell". What the writer himself describes as a "vital force, or secondary principle of life", and I have described as "a principle of life, incomplete, dependent, subordinate to the life of the whole body", is that which intrinsically constitutes each cell as an entity distinct, though not separate, from the other cells, as well as from the whole organism which is informed by the rational soul. All vital operation necessarily proceeds from an intrinsic principle, being immanent. Of course, the rational soul is also present in each cell, as it is in the whole organism, but it is not confined to the cell, as is its own constituent, and is not the principle from which immediately proceeds the vital activity peculiar to the cell as such. And equally, of course, the formal constituent principle of the human organism is not, in this view, multiple, nor is each cell a "suppositum", being neither "substantia singularis completa" nor "incommunicabiliter subsistens".

I find "propriety" defined as "accordance with established rule, customs, or principles; correctness, justness". The question at issue between Father Murphy and myself appeared to me to turn on the proper use of words, seeing that he, too, held that each cell has within itself a principle of life, though secondary.

✠ ALEXANDER MACDONALD,
Bishop of Victoria.

A CATHOLIC LAWYER'S PLEA TOUCHING THE QUESTION OF PROHIBITION IN THE UNITED STATES.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

I have read in the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW for October, 1915 (pp. 373 ff.), a very able article upon the question of Prohibition; but it seems to me the article hardly goes far enough.

There are some of our good priests who are doing all in their power to further this cause. Some of them are my best and dearest friends; and, believing that they know not the

danger to the Church that is latent in this Prohibition question, I have decided to set out here some stern facts, which have caused me as a lawyer to conclude that Prohibition contains danger for the Church, and contains possibilities that may prevent the free exercise of our holy religion.

There is a general belief that the Federal Constitution guarantees religious liberty in this country; but it does not. The subject was not mentioned in the Constitution as originally adopted, but the omission of such a clause resulted in the adoption of this amendment — in fact, this is the first amendment:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

This is plainly a limitation on Congress and not upon the States. Thus Congress could not establish a state religion, neither could it prevent the free exercise of any religion. But there is nothing to prevent the States from doing so. About four-score years ago the city of New Orleans forbade by ordinance the conduct of a funeral in any of the Catholic churches of that city. Father Permoli, pastor of St. Augustine's Church of that city, regarding the ordinance as invalid, conducted in St. Augustine's Church of that city the funeral of Louis LeRoy, for which he was arrested and fined. The case went through all the courts and finally reached the Supreme Court of the United States. That Court held:

> The Federal Constitution, providing that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof", makes no provision for protecting citizens of the respective States in their religious liberties. That is left to the State to regulate, no inhibition being imposed by the Federal Constitution on the States in this respect.[1]

This is the law to-day; not one word has been changed. In 1875 President Grant, in his last message to Congress, made this recommendation:

[1] See Father Permoli vs. New Orleans, 3 Howard (U. S.), pages 589 ff. Law Ed., page 739.

No sectarian tenets shall ever be taught to any school supported in whole or in part by the State, Nation, or by the proceeds of any tax levied upon any commodity.[2]

For the purpose of carrying out the suggestion of the President, Mr. Blaine, in 1876, introduced into the House of Representatives the following proposed amendment to the Constitution:

No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof: and no money raised by taxation in any State for the support of public schools, or derived from any public fund therefor, nor any public lands devoted thereto, shall ever be under the control of any religious denomination; nor shall any money so raised, or lands so devoted, be divided between religious sects or denominations.[3]

This amendment passed the House of Representatives on 4 August, 1876, by a vote of 180 to 7. After being slightly changed by amendment in the Senate, it was defeated in that body by a vote of 28 to 16. Two years later an amendment was proposed which prohibited any State from passing any law respecting an establishment of religion or the appropriation of any public money to the support of sectarian schools, but neither of these proposed amendments passed Congress.

These references show not only that the Constitution does not guarantee the free exercise of religion, but further that upon two occasions when Congress was asked to propose amendments that would give such guarantee, the same Congress refused to propose them, and the law remains just as it was in Father Permoli's time. Thus if any State should see fit to do so, it could so shape its laws as to forbid anyone to buy, sell, keep, or have in possession wine for any purpose, including wine for sacramental purposes; and if it did, it could enforce that law, since there is nothing in the Constitution of the United States that would prevent it.

Our clergy and Catholics generally should be acquainted with these facts and be prepared to cope with this situation, which I fear is close at hand. The first way in which this matter will ever become dangerous in this country is this:

[2] *Messages of the President*, Vol. 7, 356.

[3] *Cong. Globe*, 44 Cong., 1 sess., Aug. 4, 1876, p. 5188.

Some State will pass a law forbidding manufacture, importation, possession, or use of spirituous, vinous and malt liquors, without making an exception in case of wine to be used for sacramental purposes. Arizona has already done so. When the matter is tested out in the State courts of Arizona, if the State courts hold the law to be valid under their code—and I can see no reason why they should not—the question will be taken to the United States Supreme Court. That Court will hold that there is nothing in the Federal Constitution to prevent a State from passing such a law, even if the effect of it is to prevent the free exercise of religion. That it would prevent the free exercise of the Catholic religion is plain, since without wine there can be no celebration of the Mass. The result of such a decision would at once affect the entire country. The only way out of this threatening danger to the freedom of conscience of the nation is for the Catholic Hierarchy to urge upon Congress to accept an amendment to the Federal Constitution similar to that proposed by Mr. Blaine, which will be submitted to the States for adoption. This amendment would not become effective until adopted by three-fourths of all the States (36). The fight is likely to be furious in the States. The rabid anti-Catholics, realizing that the Mass is the central element of Catholic worship, will see the importance to them of striking at the Church in this way, and they will move heaven and earth to prevent the adoption of the amendment and secure the adoption in every State of prohibition laws similar to the law in Arizona. Ultimately, Catholics, being properly directed, are likely to win out; but the crisis will be a grave one.

The highest Court in this country, higher even than the Supreme Court of the United States, is the "Court of Public Opinion", and it behooves us to do all we can to create a healthy public regard for the Church and her liberties.

The very able article in the October REVIEW did not cover this legal phase of the question. I think it quite important that this matter should be taken up with the authorities, since it is to be feared that many of our people are not well informed upon this very important question.

W. T. DRURY, *Attorney at Law.*

Morganfield, Ky.

THE FALLEN PRIEST.[1]

I. His Guardian Angel speaks.

I saw you in the morning of your priestly life, when your soul was steeped in light, magnified by your sacerdotal character, till the whole earth was filled with its splendor; and you surpassed the sun. Then it was I saw you were indeed what my Lord had called you, "Lumen mundi"; and my fellow angels felicitated me on my happiness in being your guardian. Then your light shone in the darkness; and you imparted a flood of it to those around. They had lain darkly in the shadow of death, till, through the abundance of your light, the sin-blinded saw again. From the clouds of night that enwrapt them, you drew forth the little ones of God; and while pouring the waters of Baptism on their brows, poured also the light of Heaven around them. O Priest of God, how beautiful you were! Even Angels, though accustomed to each other's beauty, were enraptured by your loveliness. You moved on the tops of the mountains. The masses walked in the valleys waiting for your aid.

Your powers surpassed our own; for our God obeyed your voice as you called Him down each day from Heaven; and you did what God alone of Himself can do when you forgave the sins of men. No wonder you were called a god even by the Lord Himself, and a son of the Most High, each day performing, when you offered the sublime sacrifice, a greater wonder than that which God Himself had wrought when He made the Heavens.

There was no one on earth like you. The kings of the earth were not worthy to be your servants. There was no one in Heaven like you; for the Angels, though created a little higher, were lower than you in this, that you were decorated by the more sublime gifts of God. In this respect you stood next to God in God's creation. And we loved you, and hoped to share our bliss with you for eternity. Your Heavenly Father loved you; His eyes followed you, and His smile was ever resting on you. His designs upon you were noble and all divine, and the priceless gifts intended for you, no man could number or describe.

[1] We print the following reflections at the request of a venerable religious priest, in the belief that they are likely to effect good.

II. The Demon speaks.

O Priest, how fallen are you! From the highest heights to the lowest depths! Monster! The Angel spoke truly when he said there was no one on earth nor in Heaven like you, so full of light, so beautiful, so sublime, and now I say there is no one on earth so foul, so loathsome. Before you fell you were a god and a son of the Eternal. Now the very demons would scorn to associate with you; the sight of you fills them with disgust and rage; and if you die as you are, they will torture you with a refinement of cruelty for eternity. O ungrateful wretch! Where is the love and gratitude you owe your God for having raised you to such dazzling heights? You were the light of the world. Now you are blinded by the hideous darkness that envelops and saturates you. You were the lamp that lit the way to Heaven for those that followed you. You have blinded them; and multitudes besides remain in the darkness in which you found them and from which you failed to lift them.

The Church of God looked to you for splendid service, and instead thereof you have become a drag upon her progress. Her children followed you as a leader, and you have led them to destruction. O traitor, basest and meanest, how will you meet your victims on the great avenging day?

III. The Angel speaks again.

All that the demon has said of you is true. But yet, have courage! "If your sins were as red as scarlet, I will make them as white as snow." No doubt your sins are as red as scarlet. But the mercies of our God are greater than your sins. He will make them as white as snow. "Turn to Me and I will turn to you—and why will you die, O House of Israel?" I *know* He will forgive you; I *see* Him and understand His ways, and I tell you, O priest of God, He is more anxious to pardon you than you to receive His pardon. "His mercies are over all His works." Remember, He died for all without exception. Why, then, would you except yourself? He will not exclude you from the kingdom of Heaven. Why would you exclude yourself? How will you stand *eternity* in hell?

Oh, if you only knew, as we do, His sweetness, you would not hesitate a moment. How He longs to embrace you! For

remember, He is your father still. You will give Him joy, and all the angels too, if you but return to Him like the prodigal, who is the special creation of His own divine mind for the express purpose of encouraging you. One who has loved you so much as to die for you, will not refuse to forgive you. Only make haste. He promises mercy, but not time; your time perhaps is nearly exhausted. This may be His last appeal. On your knees then, before it is too late, and make an act of perfect contrition. This very day kneel at the feet of a brother priest. Strongly resolve to sin no more; and, to relieve your sorrowing heart, promise to strive your best to prevent in others thousands of sins for those you have committed.

Fly to Mary! She also loves you and will dispense to you the graces of God's treasury. And if you are faithful to her, she will not fail in fidelity to you, but will save you.

IV. Christ speaks.

I am "Alpha and Omega", the "Faithful and True", and I swear that the words of My angel to encourage you, are true; and I will stand by them, every one. My lambs are torn and bleeding—thousands, millions—I want your aid. I died for them. I died for you. Live you for Me and them. Shine once more like a bright and burning lamp in the darkness of the world. Become the leader of My people once again; and I promise you will live with Me and them in Heaven forever.

VINCENT.

"THAT DAY."

"The Dies irae has too much *that*".

Mr. Smith's criticism made the other members look up.

"Too much *that*!"

"Well, Smith, you have got us guessing. What do you mean?"

This study club of young seminarists had been discussing the beautiful sequence of the Requiem Mass. Mr. Jones had just pointed out all that was beautiful in it. Mr. Smith, who followed, was to point out its defects, if it had any.

"Yes," repeated Mr. Smith, "the Dies irae has too much *that*."

"It begins: 'Dies irae, dies illa'—day of wrath, *that* day. About the middle of it we have: 'Ne me perdas illa die', On *that* day, lose me not. And near the end: 'Lacrymosa dies illa', *That* day of weeping." Even the *Absolutio* after the Requiem is spoiled by the superfluous *that*. "Libera me Domine, in die illa", Deliver me, O Lord, on that day. "Dies illa, dies irae, calamitatis et miseriae", That day, a day of wrath, etc.

"In our translations *that* is usually and quite properly eliminated. Since there are so many beautiful synonyms for it in the Scriptures, it is really surprising that some of them were not used instead of *that*. We have the Last Day, Judgment Day, Day of Redemption, Day of Visitation, Day of Wrath and Revelation, The Great Day, Day of the Lord, Day of Christ, Day of the Lord Jesus Christ, His Day.

"*Last day*, in the story of Lazarus, has made it dear to every Christian heart. When Jesus said to Martha: 'Thy brother shall rise again', she answered: 'I know that he shall rise again at the *last day*'.[1] Martha was only repeating the word that she heard Jesus use again and again, after the feeding of the five thousand, when He spoke of the Blessed Sacrament: 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood . . . I will raise him up in the last day'.[2] Last day, with all these sweet associations and consolations, is what we should expect instead of the barren *illa—that*.

"'That we may have confidence in the *day of judgment*'[3] are words of the Beloved Disciple that rob judgment day of some of its terrors. Last day, judgment day, or any other Scriptural name is preferable to the demonstrative *that day*, a name that might be given to any day.

"So the Dies irae and the Libera would be improved by substituting some other epithet for *dies illa, that day*."

When the study club met again, Mr. Jones was ready to reply to Mr. Smith's adverse criticisms of *that day*.

"*Last day* and *day of judgment*", he said, "are phrases not found in the Old Testament, but *that day* is. "Dies illa, dies irae, calamitatis et miseriae, of the Libera is a quotation from the prophet Sophonias.[4] *That day* is not only older, but

[1] Jo. 11:23-24.
[2] Jo. 6:55.
[3] I Jo. 4:17.
[4] Soph. 1:15.

in the New Testament it is used oftener, than *last day* and *day of judgment* put together.[5] That day is the chief Scriptural designation of the judgment day.

"Our Saviour says: 'Many will say to me in that day: Lord, Lord. And then I will profess unto them, I never knew you. Depart from me.'[6] 'Of that day and hour no one knoweth.'[7] 'It will be more tolerable at that day for Sodom than for that city.'[8] 'And that day come upon you suddenly.'[9] In promising the Holy Eucharist, Jesus employs 'last day', but at the Last Supper he calls it that day: 'I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day.'[10] In speaking of the consolations that await the just, Jesus calls the final day, that day: 'In that day, you shall know that I am in the Father.'[11] 'In that day, you shall not ask me anything.'[12] 'In that day, you shall ask in my name.'[13]

"Speaking of Christ's glorious coming, and of the rewards that He will give to the faithful, St. Paul calls the great day, that day: 'When he shall come to be glorified in his saints . . . because our testimony was believed upon you in that day.'[14] 'I am certain that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.'[15] The day of his own crowning, St. Paul calls that day: 'There is laid up for me a crown of justice which the Lord the just judge will render to me in that day, and not only to me but to them also that love his coming.'[16] St. Paul asks the Lord's mercy on both the living and on the dead. Of the living he says: 'The Lord give mercy to the house of Onesiphorus,' and he sends to them his salutation.[17] But when he prays for Onesiphorus, the head of the house, his old friend who has gone, he asks mercy on that day: 'The Lord grant unto him, to find mercy of the Lord, in that day.'[18]

[5] Jo. 6:39, 40, 44, 55; 11:24; 12:48; Mt. 10:15; 11:22, 24; 12:36; II Pet. 2:9; 3:7; I Jo. 4:17.

[6] Mt. 7:22.

[7] Mt. 24:36; Mk. 13:32.

[8] Lk. 10:12.

[9] Lk. 21:34.

[10] Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25.

[11] Jo. 14:20.

[12] Jo. 16:23.

[13] Jo. 16:26.

[14] II Thess. 1:10.

[15] II Tim. 1:12.

[16] II Tim. 4:8.

[17] II Tim. 1:16; 4:19.

[18] II Tim. 1:18.

"The use and repetition of 'dies illa' in the Requiem hymn is not a blemish; it is used not merely for the sake of the rhyme, but purposely, as it is the chief Scriptural epithet for the day of judgment. Translators of the hymn who have eliminated *that day*, would have made a more perfect, literal, and Scriptural translation if they had preserved it, and we ought to use it oftener than we do."

Mr. Williams, who was the chairman of the meeting, congratulated both Mr. Smith and Mr. Jones for their excellent papers. "*That day*", he said, "occurs so frequently in Isaias [19] and in the other prophets that the makers of concordances have not taken the trouble to give all the instances. That day sometimes seems to refer to Christ's first [20] rather than to His second advent. The writers of the Old Testament, Christ, and His disciples were constantly speaking of the last day; we seldom speak of it. The subject of our next discussion will be: Why is it that we are more interested in the end of the individual, his death and particular judgment, than in *that day*, the end of all things and the general judgment?

J. F. S.

A MARRIAGE CASE.

John M. and Alma B. contracted marriage some years ago. At the time neither party was a Catholic. Recently, however, Alma became a Catholic, and, in a conversation with the priest who instructed her, mentioned incidentally that she and her husband were first cousins. Was the marriage valid? And if not, what is to be done in the circumstances?

Both parties in the case are non-Catholics at the time of the marriage. It may be that neither John nor Alma was baptized, or that either was baptized, or both, at the time of the marriage.

Both unbaptized at the time of the marriage.

The marriage is certainly affected by the impediments of the divine law, natural and positive. It is equally certain that the purely ecclesiastical impediments *as such* have no influence on its validity, for the Church has no power to regulate the marriages of those not subject to it by baptism. Hence the

[19] Is. 2:11, 17, 20; 24:21; 26:1; 27:1, 2; 29:18; 52:6.
[20] Is. 19:16, 18, 19, 23, 24.

ecclesiastical impediment of consanguinity in the second degree does not affect the marriage. But if the marriage was contracted in a State in which the civil law regarded the marriage of first cousins as null and void, the question becomes one in which theologians and canonists are not entirely agreed, since it is a disputed matter whether or not the State has the power of establishing impediments which affect the validity of the marriage of its unbaptized subjects. Almost all of the older theologians allowed that the State has this power, and the more probable opinion would pronounce the marriage of John and Alma, both being *infideles*, invalid on account of the civil impediment which renders null the marriage of first cousins. If after her conversion Alma wishes to continue to live with John, *per se* the marriage must be revalidated, i. e. a dispensation must be obtained from the existing ecclesiastical impediments, namely, disparity of worship (since John is still unbaptized) and consanguinity in the second degree. The consent should be renewed, unless the parties are in good faith and neither of them may be informed of the invalidity of the marriage without danger of serious inconveniences and especially of formal sins. In this case it would be advisable to seek a "sanatio in radice, expositis omnibus circumstantiis". This may have the excellent effect of securing from Rome an authentic decision on this much-discussed question.

Suppose, however, the marriage proved unhappy, would it be lawful to use the opinion regarding the marriage as invalid to permit Alma, recently converted, to enter into a new marriage? It would seem so, and we may apply the rule which the Holy Office has frequently given in similar cases, viz. if after the examination of a particular case there remains a doubt, the nullity of the marriage may be supposed *in favorem fidei*.

The second hypothesis is that either John or Alma was baptized at the time of the marriage. In this case the marriage was invalid because of the diriment ecclesiastical impediments of disparity of worship, existing between a baptized person and one not baptized, and of consanguinity in the second degree; for if either party be baptized the marriage is subject to the diriment impediments established by the Church, with the exception of the necessity of observing the Catholic form of

entering into marriage to which by the decree *Ne temere* those alone are bound who have been baptized in the Catholic Church.

The third hypothesis supposes that both John and Alma were baptized at the time of the marriage. In this case the marriage is invalid on account of the ecclesiastical impediment of consanguinity in the second degree.

What is to be done in the case where the marriage is invalid? If the parties are in good faith, as here, and if Alma cannot be informed of the invalidity of her marriage to John without danger of serious inconveniences and especially of formal sins, then they must be left in good faith. If both may safely be warned of the nullity of their union, both should be warned and a declaration of nullity should be obtained from the Matrimonial Curia or the marriage should be revalidated. The declaration of nullity of the marriage would be advisable when the marriage has proved unhappy in the past or is likely to prove so in the future. When the parties are informed of the nullity of the marriage, with a view to revalidating the marriage, it would be advisable to have on the spot the dispensations necessary to revalidate the marriage. It will generally happen that it would not be advisable to inform the non-Catholic of the invalidity of the marriage. Then a *sanatio in radice* may be applied for.

JOSEPH MACCARTHY.

New York City.

WHEN THE FIRST FRIDAY IS GOOD FRIDAY.

Qu. In the May number (1915) of the REVIEW I read: "When, therefore, as this year, one of the First Fridays falls on Good Friday, it is not counted as an interruption (of the Novena)". I have advised my parishioners according to your answer. The Promoter, however, not satisfied with this solution, has written to the Central Office of the Apostleship of Prayer and has received the following answer: "Our Lord seems to leave no doubt that the Communions must be made on nine consecutive First Fridays; hence, when the sequence has been broken, as it was this year (1915), it is best to start it all over again." Now next year, 1917, Good Friday will be a First Friday, also in 1920, 1926, 1931, etc. Will you kindly answer what a pastor should do, and how he should advise his people.

Resp. The question turns on the presumed intention of our Lord in making the promise to Blessed Margaret Mary. There is no authoritative interpretation of the promise. No doubt, the advice given by the Central Office of the Apostleship of Prayer is the safer one. Still, if the series of consecutive Fridays cannot be begun again without inconvenience, one may presume that the special favors will be granted, when the interruption was caused not by any act or omission on the part of the person performing the devotion, but on account of the requirements of the Liturgy. Our correspondent, since he is evidently one of those who study the calendar carefully, may advise his parishioners so to arrange their performance of the devotion as not to include Good Friday in the series.

CATHOLIC BOOKS ON PHILOSOPHY.

Qu. Young men who attend the State University often ask me to prescribe for them a course of reading in scholastic philosophy in order to straighten out their ideas, which naturally become twisted in the classes of philosophy, education, history, etc. What would you suggest in addition to the Stonyhurst Series, which I have? As a rule, they will not read, or cannot read German or French.

Resp. A great deal depends on whether our correspondent has in view an extended course, or a more elementary study. In any case, he might, for example, recommend the study of the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, either a systematic study of the topics and articles indexed under "Philosophy", or the occasional consultation of the articles "Agnosticism", "God", "Mysticism", and so forth, according as these topics are treated in class. Perrier's *Revival of Scholasticism* (New York: Columbia University Press) and Rickaby's *Scholasticism* (London: Constable) contain good elementary accounts of scholastic doctrine. In the classes of history of philosophy, Turner's *History of Philosophy* (Boston: Ginn & Co.) may be found useful. Dubray's *Introductory Philosophy* (Longmans) is an excellent compendium of scholastic doctrine. For more advanced reading, Walker's *Theories of Knowledge* (Longmans), Coffey's *Logic* (2 vols., Longmans) and *Ontology* (Longmans), Driscoll, *The Soul* (Benziger), *God* (Benziger) and *Pragmatism* (Longmans), and Brother Azarias's *Essays*

Philosophical (Chicago, McBride) can be recommended. Mivart's works, especially *Truth* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench) and *Lessons from Nature* (London: Murray), and Father Wassmann's *Modern Biology and Theory of Evolution* (Herder) will be found helpful in the discussion of the problem of Evolution. Where there is a Catholic Club for University students these books should be placed in the library or reading room. Our correspondent, we are sure, is interested enough to procure them for his own library and to put them, from time to time, in the hands of those who need them.

VISITING PRIESTS AND THE CONFESSIONS OF NUNS.

Qu. May a local Superior request any approved priest visiting the Convent to hear the confessions of religious who may wish to go to him?

Resp. Not indiscriminately, but in the following cases:

(1) if the religious wishing to confess be seriously ill though not necessarily in danger of death;

(2) if the visiting priest be the extraordinary confessor, even though it be outside the ember weeks;

(3) if the priest be one of a number of diocesan confessors specially designated by the Ordinary (as a decree of the S. Congr. for Religious, 3 February, 1913, provides) [1] on whom the religious may call at any time, even though he be not the regular or the extraordinary confessor of the community;

(4) if the priest, being approved for the diocese, hear the confession, not actually in the convent, but in an adjoining church or chapel.

SEMI-PUBLIC ORATORIES AND THE OBLIGATION OF HEARING MASS.

Qu. We have in our parish a community of nuns who have a small chapel or oratory where Mass is said for their special convenience daily. The people of the parish as well as the nuns have been instructed that laics are not to attend Mass in the Sisters' chapel on Sundays and holidays of obligation, but must come to the parish

[1] "Unicuique domui religiosae aliquot ab Ordinario sacerdotes deputentur quos Religiosae in casibus particularibus confessionis peragendae causa facile vocare queant." (Cf. ECCL. REVIEW, May, 1913, p. 596.)

church. This is not merely for the purpose of securing the support of the church and clergy, but also for the sake of order and to insure the attendance at the instructions that accompany the parish Mass.

Nevertheless it happens on rainy days and other times that persons living near the convent slip into the Sisters' chapel, and consequently absent themselves from the parish service. Do such people satisfy the obligation of hearing Mass? The answer hinges, I understand, upon the question whether the Sisters' chapel is a private or a semi-public oratory. The former is an oratory for the exclusive use of certain persons. Others who attend Mass there do not satisfy the precept of the Church. Am I right?

Resp. The Mass precept refers to Mass celebrated in churches and in public or semi-public chapels, except for those who have the personal privilege of a *private* chapel. But the chapels attached to religious communities are not private chapels in the canonical sense. Hence, whatever is implied in the obligation (in conscience) to support one's parish church, persons who fail to attend Mass there do not violate the precept of the Church which obliges them to hear Mass on Sundays and holidays, so long as they assist at Mass in the convent chapel. This has been made quite plain by various decisions of the S. Congregation. The following is the text of a comparatively recent decree on the subject:

SUPER ORATORIIS SEMIPUBLICIS.

A Sacra Rituum Congregatione saepe postulatum est quaenam oratoria semipublica habenda sint. Constat porro oratoria publica ea esse, quae auctoritate Ordinarii ad publicum Dei cultum perpetuo dedicata, benedicta vel etiam solemniter consecrata, januam habent in via, vel liberum a publica via fidelibus universim pandunt ingressum. Privata e contra stricto sensu dicuntur oratoria, quae in privatis aedibus in commodum alicujus personae vel familiae ex Indulto Sanctae Sedis erecta sunt. Quae medium inter haec duo locum tenent, ut nomen ipsum indicat, oratoria semipublica sunt et vocantur.

Ut autem quaelibet ambiguitas circa haec oratoria amoveatur, SS. D. N. Leo PP. XIII ex Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis consulto, statuit et declaravit: Oratoria semipublica ea esse, quae etsi in loco quodammodo privato, vel non absolute publico, auctoritate Ordinarii erecta sunt; commodo tamen non fidelium omnium nec privatae tantum personae aut familiae, sed alicujus communitatis vel personarum coetus inserviunt. In his omnes qui sacrosancto Missae sacrificio intersunt, praecepto audiendi Sacrum satisfacere valent. Hujus

generis oratoria sunt quae pertinent ad Seminaria et Collegia ecclesiastica; ad pia instituta et societates votorum simplicium, aliasque communitates sub regula sive statutis saltem ab Ordinario approbatis; ad domus spiritualibus exercitiis addictas; ad convictus et hospitia juventuti litteris, scientiis aut artibus instituendae destinatis; ad nosocomia, orphanotrophia, nec non ad arces et carceres; atque similia oratoria in quibus ex instituto, aliquis Christifidelium coetus convenire solet ad audiendam missam.

Quibus adjungi debent Capellae, in coemeterio rite erectae, dummodo in missae celebratione non iis tantum ad quos pertinent, sed aliis etiam fidelibus aditus pateat. Voluit autem sarta et tecta jura ac privilegia Oratoriorum, quibus fruuntur Emi S. R. E. Cardinales, Rmi Sacrorum Antistites, atque Ordines Congregationesque Regulares. Ac praeterea confirmare dignata est Decretum in una Nivernen. diei 8 Martii 1879. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 23 Januarii 1899.

C. Episc. Praen. Card. Mazella, *S. R. C. Praef.*
Diomedes Panici, *S. R. C. Secretarius.*

BAPTISM OF PROTESTANT MINORS WITHOUT PARENTS' CONSENT.

Qu. I should like to have your opinion about this case. There are in a certain Catholic asylum two Protestant girls. One of them is sixteen, the other, fifteen. They are very well instructed in the Catholic religion and like to attend the Catholic services. Now, they wish to become Catholics, but the Sister Superior, on the advice of a priest, refuses to take any steps in the matter without the consent of the girls' mother, who is a Presbyterian, and who is believed to be opposed to the conversion of her daughters. The Sister Superior wishes to wait until her charges are eighteen years of age; meantime neither she nor any of the other Sisters has spoken to the girls about changing their religion. I should like to ask you whether baptism may be denied because of the mother's opposition, an opposition which would bring trouble to the Sisters? What is the chaplain to do?

Resp. The Superior, it seems to us, is right, not because the opposition of the mother "would bring trouble to the Sisters", a motive which our correspondent should not so readily ascribe, but because, in the circumstances, there is grave danger that, if the children were baptized against the mother's consent, they would be taken from the asylum and prevented from practising their religion. The theological principles in-

volved in cases of this kind are clearly stated by Noldin (De Sacramentis, p. 78): "Certum est ecclesiam jus habere baptizandi filios haereticorum et impediendi quominus parentum erroribus imbuantur, quia haeretici ab ecclesia, cuius subditi sunt, ad legem divinam servandam compelli possunt. Ecclesia tamen non utitur jure suo, quia impedire nequit quominus filii haereticorum in haeresi educantur." There is, besides, an explicit decree of the Holy Office, dated 26 August, 1885, which forbids the baptism of the children of heretics unless there is a probable hope that they will be educated in the true faith. There is no such hope in the case of a girl of fifteen or sixteen, no matter how well disposed she may be at present, if she were turned over to a Presbyterian mother who has already expressed her opposition. If the parents of the children were unbaptized, *infideles* in the theological sense, the case would be still stronger, because in that event the Church claims no right at all in the matter until the children are old enough to make a deliberate choice and are so placed that there is no probable danger of perversion.

INTENTION REQUISITE FOR RECEPTION OF BAPTISM.

Qu. Some time ago, a lady who was, on the next day, to undergo a serious operation, wished to be baptized. When I asked her whether she desired to become a Catholic, she answered "No". She wished "to become a Christian without respect to any particular denomination". She had not been baptized before. What should be done in the case?

Resp. In the case of adults certain dispositions are required for the valid and fruitful reception of the sacrament of Baptism. These are generally enumerated as *intention, faith, knowledge*, and *contrition*, and theologians teach that their presence need not be a matter of certitude, but that a probability, even a slight probability, of their existence is sometimes sufficient. Here it is a question of the first of these dispositions, namely, *intention*. More particularly, it is a question whether the intention in the case is sufficient for the valid reception of the sacrament. Ordinarily, the adult "subject" of baptism intends not only to receive the sacrament but also to undertake all the obligations which the reception of the

sacrament entails. The "subject" in the case positively excludes these obligations in a general way when she refuses to become a Catholic. There is a conflict of intentions. On the one hand, she evidently wishes to become a Christian; on the other, she explicitly refuses to become a Catholic. The first necessarily carries with it the intention of assuming the obligation of leading a Christian life; the second directly excludes that obligation. Therefore, it seems to us that the second intention inevitably negatives the first, and consequently there is lacking the intention which is required in an adult for the valid reception of baptism.

THE NUPTIAL BLESSING.

Qu. On page 317 of the REVIEW, Vol. XXIII, I read: "The blessing of the nuptials takes place in the Mass *pro Sponsis*, from which it is never to be separated". Wapelhorst, however, (page 460, n. 2) and the *Ordo* for the Diocese of .... maintain that the nuptial blessing must be given even when the nuptial Mass is not celebrated. How do you explain this contradiction? It has caused no little inconvenience to others as well as to me.

Resp. We think there must be a misunderstanding arising from the fact that the blessing in the Roman Ritual is confounded with the blessing in the Missal. The former, "Respice, etc.", is always given, even when the rubrics forbid the nuptial Mass. The latter is never to be given "extra Missam". In the new edition of Wapelhorst, page 486, we read: "Haec benedictio nuptialis in missa pro sponso et sponsa semper impertienda est in matrimonio Catholicorum, *intra tamen Missae celebrationem*", and the words, apparently, are taken textually from a decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition. When there is mention of the "solemn blessing" of nuptials, this blessing is meant. We have not access to the *Ordo* of the diocese mentioned in the query. We take for granted, however, that it has reference to an instruction contained in the same decree of the Inquisition. The instruction is to the effect that, if a Catholic bride and groom have not had a nuptial Mass, and have, therefore, received merely the blessing contained in the ritual, not the "solemn blessing", they may at any time afterward receive the "solemn bless-

ing" *intra Missam*, and are exhorted to do so, except of course in the case of a bride who was a widow and had received the blessing at her first marriage. To make the matter perfectly clear, let us suppose the following cases:

1. *Tempore non clauso*, the rubrics permitting, the bride and groom first receive the blessing contained in the ritual, and then during the nuptial Mass the "solemn blessing" contained in the Missal.

2. *Tempore non clauso*, when the rubrics do not permit a nuptial Mass, the Mass of the day is read, with the "Commemoration" of the bride and groom and the "solemn blessing" contained in the Missal.

3. *Tempore clauso*, when, by dispensation, a marriage is blessed, according to the ritual, a Mass may be offered for the intention of the bride and groom, but the nuptial Mass may not be celebrated, the "commemoration" is not inserted in the Mass that is offered, the "solemn blessing" is not given from the Missal.

When for any of these reasons, or from sheer neglect, the "solemn blessing" has not been given at the time of the marriage, it may be given later, but *intra missam*.

OBLIGATIONS ARISING FROM PRIVATE BETROTHAL.

Qu. In the January issue of the REVIEW, in answer to the proposed query (p. 105), "whether or not a promise to marry made verbally, that is, not according to the form prescribed by the *Ne temere*, binds in conscience," you seem to affirm that it does. With this, *salva reverentia*, I do not agree.

To illustrate: John promises to marry Bertha. The agreement is made verbally. Some time afterward, John meets Lucy, and, attracted, say, by her wealth, without consulting Bertha, proposes to and is accepted by Lucy.

It is clear to all that the first private "sponsalia" entered into with Bertha is null and void canonically and *in foro externo*. But is John free from the moral obligation of fulfilling his promise to Bertha? This question has a practical importance, and is, I am sure, frequently met with in the confessional, especially in this country where so few engagements are contracted according to the recent discipline of the Church.

That the Pope has jurisdiction over "sponsalia" both in *foro externo* and *interno* is commonly admitted. He frequently exercises this jurisdiction by granting a dispensation from the impedient impediment arising from valid "sponsalia", so that the engagement is dissolved and both parties may validly and *licitly* contract other engagements; in other words, the moral obligation arising from the engagement has been removed. Dispensations of this kind are sufficiently numerous, and an example of one may be found in the *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. 18, p. 506.

Granted that the Pope has the power of declaring private "sponsalia", not entered into according to the *Ne temere*, invalid, not only in *foro externo* but also in *foro conscientiae*, the question arises, Has he done so? My reasons for affirming that he has done so by the decree *Ne temere* are these:

(1) The decree reads: "Ea tantum sponsalia habentur valida et canonicos sortiuntur effectus, quae," etc.; that is, as Cardinal Gennari writes in his treatise on the new matrimonial legislation, "Sponsalia contracted without these formalities not only do not produce their canonical effects but are also null." Null both *in foro externo* and *interno*, for in the *Ne temere* there is no distinction made between the two, and as our old professor of Moral would quote: "Ubi lex non distinguit, nec nos distinguere debemus."

(2) If we compare the words of the decree invalidating private "sponsalia" with the words which annul clandestine marriage, our argument is confirmed. "Ea tantum sponsalia habentur valida"—"ea tantum matrimonia valida sunt". Now it is certain that these last words invalidate clandestine marriages *in foro interno* as well as *in foro externo*. It is hardly within the laws of right reason to understand the invalidating of private "sponsalia" in any other sense, for the expressions are nearly identical, and we have no good reason for interpreting them differently in the two cases.

(3) Even previous to the *Ne temere*, "sponsalia" in Spain were not considered valid in the eyes of the Church unless contracted by means of the written instrument of a public notary, and this same condition was at the request of the Plenary Council of Latin America held in 1899 extended to the Republics of Central and South America. Some time later a doubt arose whether "sponsalia" not contracted in writing were not valid *at least in foro interno*. To the Sacred Congregation of Extra. Eccl. Affairs was sent the question, "Suntne invalida praedicta sponsalia [private engagements] absque publica scriptura, etiam in foro interno?" And the Congregation responded: "Affirmative, seu esse invalida etiam in foro interno" (*Acta S. Sedis*, vol. 34, p. 398).

This decision is quite decisive; and there can be no doubt that "sponsalia" contracted without the formalities prescribed in the decree *Ne temere* will be equally invalid *in foro externo* and *in foro interno*, and will produce no moral obligation to fulfil the promise of marriage.

Resp. The argument in favor of the invalidity of "sponsalia" both "in foro externo" and "in foro interno" in the case is ably and conclusively established by our correspondent. There is, therefore, not only no impediment *publicae honestatis* but also no obligation in conscience to contract marriage with Bertha. There is, however, another question, namely, whether, even when there is no betrothal in the canonical sense, but there is nevertheless a true and sincere promise of marriage, other obligations may not arise. For instance, theologians seem to agree that if, relying on the promise, Bertha were to undergo expenses in view of the coming marriage, would not John be obliged in conscience to make those expenses good? At least, it seems certain that, after John, "without consulting Bertha, proposes to, and is accepted by, Lucy", he would be obliged to notify Bertha, and, if he did not, would be bound to make amends for such loss as she may incur. In other words, granting that there is no obligation in conscience to marry Bertha, there may be other obligations toward her. And that, precisely, was our contention in the previous case [1] to which our correspondent refers. We did not say that, at the end of the year, or at any time, A was obliged to marry B, but that, the wording of the case not being clear, there *may be* on the part of A an obligation to ask B for a release from his promise.

SERVER AT MASS.

Qu. Will you kindly answer the following questions:

1. Is there any decree of the S. Congregation of Rites relating to the celebration of Mass in this country without a server?

2. Does the priest sin who celebrates without a server, when one can be procured in a very short time?

3. What is to be said about the celebration of High Mass with deacon and subdeacon but without any other ministers, when such could be had with very slight or no inconvenience?

[1] REVIEW, December, 1915, p. 105.

Resp. The second and third questions answer themselves. If the conditions are such that a server or a number of acolytes can be secured at a moment's notice, there is no room for opinions in the case. With regard to the first query, there is, so far as we know, no decree of the S. Congregation of Rites relating to the celebration of Mass without a server in the United States. Any priest may, of course, celebrate without a server when he is obliged by precept to do so, or when Mass must be celebrated either to consecrate for Viaticum or to allow the people to fulfil their obligation on Sunday or holiday. Apart from these cases, missionary priests enjoy the privilege "celebrandi sine ministro, si aliter celebrari non potest". This is the usual formula. There remains the question of interpreting the phrase "si aliter celebrari non potest", a question which is of course open to much discussion. As far back as 1877 Bishop Baltes secured what seems to be the only authoritative interpretation. "To remove all doubt," he writes in his pastoral letter of October, 1877, "we consulted authorities at Rome on this point. The present Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda answered that this faculty might be used any day (not only on Sundays and holidays) *if otherwise the priest would have to omit the celebration of Mass.*" [1]

[1] See REVIEW, Vol. VII (1892), p. 381.

Ecclesiastical Library Table

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

CHRISTOLOGICAL THEORIES. 13.

A HARVARD CHRISTOLOGY.

Last summer a devoted Catholic mother told me with joy that her boy had just finished High School and passed his entrance examination for Harvard. It had not occurred to her that the boy might lose all faith unless his understanding of his own faith were in direct proportion to his understanding of other things. Her pastor had forestalled any such fear. He favored the Harvard plan, and thought that home influence would fully replace the influence of a Catholic college. To show the advantages provided by the great institution, she proffered me an imposing list of professors and instructors of Harvard College from which the lad could make choice of a director, a man who would take a personal interest alike in his studies and moral training. Among those listed for the direction of this Catholic boy unto eternal salvation were the professors whose ideas about Christ we shall set before the readers of the REVIEW. The lady was shocked to learn from me what stumbling-blocks to faith were set at Harvard along the way of youth; yet she has sent her boy to that college. Her fond hope is that, during his four years, he may either run around or leap over the stumbling-blocks, while running his race of the faith. St. Paul, on this race-course, wrote to the Corinthians: "I so run as not to run at random." [1] The Catholic who wishes his son not to swerve, in random wise, but to dash straight onward toward the goal which is Jesus Christ, would do well to keep him from the influence of the Christological ideas of Lake, Royce, and others of the Harvard faculty.

I. Dr. Lake's Christology. The Harvard Christologist, who is now most in the limelight, is Dr. Kirsopp Lake. For seven years he was curate in the famous University Church of St. Mary the Virgin, at Oxford. And he seems during that time to have been after the mind of Bishop Gore of Oxford, and to have had ideas no more dangerous or far removed from

[1] 1 Cor. 9:26.

Catholic doctrine than are those contained in the *Plain and Parochial Sermons* that Newman preached in the same venerable church. In fact, Dr. Lake may have during those years persuaded himself that he was a Catholic. This persuasion he still has. And one may now and again be misled by his utterances into the fancy that his Catholicity is thoroughgoing. Witness his comment on Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy's *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions:* [2]

> He never looks at early Christianity except through the spectacles of Protestant theology. . . . It is necessary to insist that the Catholic is much nearer to early Christianity than the Protestant, and there is not in the Catholic eye any antithesis between faith and the sacraments.[3]

It was after this period of old-fashioned Anglicanism that Dr. Lake was offered the chair of New Testament Exegesis and Early Christian Literature in the University of Leiden. During a ten-year tenure of office at the Dutch University, he issued some excellent textual studies. His little handbook on *The Text of the New Testament* [4] shows scholarship and sobriety of judgment such as are hopelessly wanting in the Christological work for which Dr. Lake is now far-famed. It was in 1913 that he made quite a stir, at the Lowell Institute and in King's Chapel, in Boston, by the lectures which he later evolved into *The Stewardship of Faith.*[5] He was that year, according to *Minerva* [6] for 1913-1914, a loan professor to Harvard from Leiden. His eschatology impressed the great American university. He was right up-to-date. Any one who treats of our Lord without eschatology is ten years behind the times. Harvard must not be behind the times; she must be up-to-date *à tout prix.* And so she offered Dr. Lake the chair of Early Christian Literature. This chair he now fills. And since it was his eschatology that won him the seat, the Christ-theories of Dr. Lake are very important to any one who would have a clear line of vision into the Harvard Christologies, or Christ-theories.

[2] Hodder: London, 1913.
[3] *Harvard Theological Review*, July, 1914, p. 429.
[4] Rivington: London, 5th ed., 1911.
[5] G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York. 1915.
[6] "Jahrbuch der Gelehrten Welt" (Trübner: Strassburg, 1914).

II. Resurrection-theory. Even before Dr. Lake came to Harvard, we were already prepared to be startled by his extravagances in Christology. His ideas in regard to the Resurrection of Christ[7] had established for him, among liberal Protestants, the reputation of "a scholarship of rare quality, a judgment well balanced, a remarkable insight into historical situations".[8] And any professor of an ecclesiastical subject in one of our great universities, who is nowadays so reputed, seems to feel it his bounden duty to become more and more rash as his repute gains ground. At any rate, more and more rash is Dr. Lake become.

1. *A Spiritualistic Manifestation.* The historical evidence for the belief in the Resurrection he finds to be convincing; that is to say, the early Church undoubtedly believed that Jesus had *physically* risen from the dead. But such a resurrection is out of the question. *Ça va sans dire*, to the "judgment well balanced"! And so Dr. Lake is put to his wit's end to explain this historical fact of the belief of the early Church. What caused it?

Was the witness of the Apostles to the Resurrection vitiated by subjective hallucination? Scarcely so! "Hallucination is certainly an unjustifiable word, if it would imply that the disciples were pathologically influenced by some defect in their senses."[9] What really happened was that the apparitions of the form of Jesus were "due not to its own nature but to that of the disciples". There was no physical form of the Risen Jesus, unless in the imaginations of the Apostles. There was some "objective presence". Not of the physical Christ; for that would imply physical Resurrection, and physical Resurrection is not admitted by Dr. Lake. Nor does he like "the cumbersome expression, subjective-objective appearance".[10] What, then, was the objective form that caused the subjective impression of the Resurrection? Merely a spirit such as spiritualists conjure up. For the phenomena collected by the

[7] "The historical evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ." By Kirsopp Lake, Professor of New Testament Exegesis and early Christian literature in the University of Leiden. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.)

[8] Cf. "Dr. Kirsopp Lake on *The Stewardship of Faith*." By Rev. Maurice Jones, D.D., *The Expositor*, Jan. 1916, p. 17.

[9] "The historical evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ," p. 271.

[10] Ibid., p. 272.

Society of Psychical Research give us "direct evidence for the survival of human personality after death, and its power under certain circumstances of communicating with us".[11] And so the "scholarship of rare quality" of this Harvard professor reduces the resurrected Christ to the low grade of a spook in a spiritualistic séance.

2. *A Psychic Phenomenon.* There is another explantion of the objective something that caused in the Apostles the subjective impression that Jesus had really and physically risen from the dead. This explanation is deemed by Dr. Lake to be "possible, even if less probable". It is the "theory of subliminal consciousness".

> Our minds often work without our conscious knowledge . . . and the results of this unconscious working often rise, as it were, suddenly above the threshold of consciousness, so that we are startled to find ourselves in the presence of an unexpected guest. . . . If there was a case of a man who before his death left a document in a hidden place, and after his death appeared and revealed both the place and the contents of the letter, it would be possible to say that the knowledge had really been transferred before his death, unconsciously, to the subliminal conscience of some acquaintance. Then, after his death, something happened to bring this subliminal conscience to the surface, and so the knowledge previously transferred was found, and by the natural processes of thought either "visualised" into an "appearance", or "auralised" into a "message".[12]

We are not sure of the thought back of these words, but think it is this: Jesus is supposed to have told some of his disciples that he would rise from the dead, and to have given them a message. They tucked away this bit of information and the message, too, in their subliminal conscience. Then, after the death of our Lord, "something happened to bring this subliminal conscience to the surface". Dr. Lake thinks that the strong point in this theory is the fact that it is generally a shock that brings the subliminal conscience to the surface; and the gruesome death of Jesus was such a shock. "The weak point is that it is so extraordinarily complicated that it seems easier to believe that the appearances really are those of surviving personality."

[11] Ibid., p. 273.

[12] Ibid., p. 274.

3. *Neither Theory tenable.* To the Catholic, both theories are blasphemous. Undoubtedly the personality of Jesus survives after death; it is Divine. And as to the human personality, there was none to survive. Dr. Lake's theory assumes that Jesus was an ordinary man. Not only that, it excludes all supernatural elements from the Gospel narrative as non-historical. Miracles are impossible, he assumes; and therefore a physical Resurrection is out of the question. If such were the case, the sensible thing for Dr. Lake would seem to be to throw over the whole Gospel narrative as lacking in historic foundation rather than to torture himself to explain how the conscience of the early Church was duped either by its own subliminal conscience come again to the surface or by the survival of a human personality that never had existed.

III. Eschatological Theory. It was bad enough to deny the physical Resurrection of Christ and to try to explain the Catholic belief in the Resurrection as the effect of either a spiritualistic manifestation or a psychic phenomenon. It was much worse on the part of Dr. Lake to flop over completely to the side of Johannes Weiss, Albrecht Schweitzer, Alfred Loisy, George Tyrrell and Professor Burkitt; and to become an out-and-out eschatologist.

1. *The Blasphemy of the Eschatologist.* We have twice explained at some length the eschatological theory.[13] Briefly, it consists in the denial of the Divinity of Jesus and in the assumption that he was a dupe in regard to the ἔσχατα, the *last things*, the end of the world. He thought that the end of the world would be in his lifetime; that there would be a catastrophe before his death; and, at this catastrophe, his kingdom would be established. In this he was deluded. He died; and no catastrophe took place. His followers were face to face with the ENTWEDER-ODER of Harnack. EITHER they had to acknowledge that he was a dupe and to admit his absolute failure; OR they had to make him out to have been God. They chose the latter of the alternatives. Thus the Christian conscience began to evolve the christological ideas that resulted in the definition of Chalcedon: "Very God and Very Man".

[13] For Tyrrell's theory, cf. "Jesus or Christ? A Christological Symposium", ECCL. REVIEW, March, 1915, pp. 365 ff. For the others, cf. "The Eschatological Christ", ECCL. REVIEW, June, 1915, pp. 735 ff.

That is the blasphemous theory of the eschatological school of Christology. Schweitzer makes the whole thing still more repulsive by suggesting that for ENTWEDER-ODER we substitute UND-UND; instead of an EITHER-OR theory we have the BOTH-AND theory. BOTH the admission had to be made by the early Church that Jesus was duped; AND the Christian conscience, out of this consciousness of failure evolved its consciousness of the Divinity of Jesus.

2. *Veiled in Dr. Lake's Stewardship.* This eschatological, this catastrophic view of the universe, is Dr. Lake's first principle of Christianity. True, he glosses things over, he veils the hideous face of his Christ-theory with a Modernistic *chiffonerie;* but back of the filmy, flimsy, silken words lurks the hideous horror of the *Jesus-bild* of Schweitzer. For, despite all the rags and tags of meaningless praise that the Harvard professor gives to Jesus, Dr. Lake is, as Dr. Maurice Jones puts it, " a thorough-going eschatologist ",[14] as great an enemy to Jesus as was George Tyrrell.

3. *The Veil is Modernism.* An enemy of Jesus? Why, the Professor's *Stewardship of Faith* is professedly the preservation of faith in Jesus. "Christianity has always been a movement: the *stewardship of faith* is to carry on that movement ".[15] Yes, but how? By carrying on ever the same belief in Jesus as the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon formulated? No, not at all! That would be an attempt to carry on the same theology! And theology cannot possibly be carried on ever the same. To carry on the movement of Christianity, as a true steward of the faith, is *to adapt it to the times.* For the stewardship of the faith is a " process of *changing theology* ".[16] Christianity is dynamic, and not static; it is a life, and not a thing at a standstill!

But hold! St. Paul tells Timothy, "Guard thou the glorious deposit that has been entrusted to thee ".[17] Does Dr. Lake agree with St. Paul? It seems not. St. Paul was not a steward of the faith after the fashion of Dr. Lake. Pauline stewardship meant to keep the deposit of the faith from chang-

[14] *Expositor,* Jan. 1916, p. 20.
[15] " Stewardship of Faith," p. 191.
[16] Op. cit., p. 191.
[17] II Tim. 1 : 14.

ing; Dr. Lake's stewardship means to keep Christianity ever changing. Which of the two was right?

That would be a peculiar question for Dr. Lake fairly to face. Because he thinks that St. Paul was one of the great stewards of the faith precisely by keeping up "the process of changing theology", of adapting Christianity to new conditions. The "man of many a shift" in doctrine is the real steward of Dr. Lake's modernistic faith.

It is no stewardship of faith to stay the ever-changing flow of theology; for Christianity, so far as its theology is concerned, is essentially fluid. A man's religion does not change. But a man's religion is not his theology. Religion is "conscious communion of man with a higher spiritual being. Theology is partly a theory to account for religion, partly a series of inductions based on religion". The communion will ever be the same; the theories will ever vary, as will the inductions. Hence the folly of making theology a basis of union. "The Church has too often forgotten that the basis of her corporate life ought to be a common religion, not necessarily a common theology." [18]

4. *A Phase of Lutheranism.* This "common religion", in the last analysis of Dr. Lake's writings, is the common faith which he wishes all men to hand on to others. The faith to be handed down the centuries is not our Catholic faith; it is neither an act of belief nor any creed believed; it is Luther's faith, with a Ritschlian twist to it—a trust in the value that the Christ-idea is to us. All Christians are stewards of faith in this, that they express their trust in Christ in one way or another. And so "The Stewardship of Faith" is the multiform and manifold expression of the trust in Christ that goes on down the centuries.

To the Catholic theologian, faith is not trust at all, but an act of the reason—the belief in a truth solely on the authority of God revealing. This nature of Catholic faith Dr. Lake fails to grasp. Why so?

He makes profession of profound esteem for Catholic theology and seems to have made some effort to understand it. This effort has been hindered by his use of Modernistic writers like Tyrrell. He tells us:

[18] Cf. "The Resurrection of Jesus Christ," p. 278.

The Catholic theology is magnificent: but it is not intelligible except to properly trained intellects.[19]

So he tries to make it intelligible by "putting it into modern language". He should have written "Modernistic language". For Dr. Lake is another instance of ruin wrought by Modernism.

IV. Static Christianity. Before proceeding any farther in our study of Dr. Lake's Christology, eschatology and Modernism, we wish to register a protest against the Modernistic cant that we Catholics make Christianity to have been always *static*, whereas it really was and is *dynamic*. Unfortunately some Catholic writers accept the charge and the terminology, and speak of Christianity as *static* over against Modernistic "*dynamic* Christianity". There is no need of so great a subservience to an insolent charge; there is need of a protest against a misleading distinction. Catholic Christianity is not at all *static* in the Modernistic sense of the word; this we shall show next month. Catholic Christianity is thoroughly *dynamic* in St. Paul's sense and in the sense derived from the figure of speech. If electrostatics and electrodynamics are to provide an illustration of the difference between Catholic and Modernistic Christianity, that figure must be correct in its application. We shall later show how incorrect is the Modernistic application thereof.

Mr. Edward Ingram Watkins, in *Some Thoughts on Catholic Apologetics*,[20] is an instance of a Catholic who makes an unhappy use of this Modernistic terminology:

> Modern thought is *dynamic* and particular. Catholic thought, on the other hand, is *static* and universal. . . . Modern thought is preeminently fluid and changing, both in itself and in its general view of reality; Catholic thought is preëminently fixed, both subjectively and objectively.[20]

The reason for accepting the Modernistic rating of Catholic thought as static and not dynamic seems to be the desire to be understood by the non-Catholic. For the author tells Catholics: "Do speak so that non-Catholics can and will listen to

[19] "Stewardship," p. 188.

[20] Manresa Press: Roehampton, London, 1915, pp. 56 ff.

you ".[21] By all means, "speak so that non-Catholics will listen to you ", but not so that they will misunderstand you. For instance, Dr. Moffat scarcely understood Mr. Watkins's rating of Christianity as *static*, else he might have had a word of encouragement and not a slur for the little book on *Catholic Apologetics*.[22] To Dr. Moffatt the use of the term *static* meant that we Catholics consider Christianity a *dead thing*—a thing that may be taken down like a dose in a capsule. Our Christianity is nothing of the sort!

1. *How static?* We should have no objection to the Modernistic distinction between static and dynamic Christianity if it merely meant that the Christianity of the Catholic Church has a *fixed deposit of faith* whereas the Christless Christianity of the Modernist has no fixed creed. For firm-fixed is the deposit of faith, as we know on the authority of Christ.

2. *Because Christ's Teaching is fixed.* From the Heavenly Father, Jesus had a fixed message of revealed truth to give to the world; and this very message he gave to his Church to hand down to the world until the end thereof. "As the Father sent me, so I send you." [23] The mission of Jesus and of his Church is the same. The message of Jesus and of his Church is the same. "All things whatsoever I have heard from my Father, I have made known to you." [24] Nothing of the message that Jesus got of his Father was omitted from the message given by Jesus to the Apostles. "All things "—not whatsoever things are necessary for the present state of the consciousness of the Church, but "All things . . . I have made known to you ".

True, these truths were to be more fully unfolded later on by the Holy Spirit:

> I still have much to say to you, but ye cannot bear it now. Yet, when he—the Spirit of Truth—cometh, he will guide you unto all truth; for he will not speak on his own authority, but will speak of all that he heareth; and he will tell you of the things that are to come. He will glorify me; for he will take of what is mine, and

[21] Cf. Preface, p. vii.

[22] *Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1916, p. 437.

[23] Jo. 20:21.

[24] Jo. 15:15.

will tell it to you. Everything that the Father has is mine; that is why I said that he taketh of what is mine and will tell it to you.[25]

These meaningful words picture the Holy Spirit, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son as from one principle, under the guise of an Ambassador whose message is on the authority of him who sends. Jesus represents *himself* as the Ambassador of the *Father*, and the *Holy Spirit* as the Ambassador of the *Son*. As the Son gives no message to the world on his own authority, but, proceeding from the Father, speaks to the world on the authority of the Father, so the Holy Spirit has naught to tell the world on his own authority, but, proceeding from the Father and the Son, speaks to the world on the authority of the Father and the Son.

In the light of these words, it is clear that the message of truth, given by Jesus Christ to the Church, was completed by the time of his Ascension, and completely evolved in the consciousness of the Church, by the revelations of the Holy Spirit, before the death of John, c. 110 A. D. Thereafter, according to the words of Christ, the deposit of faith was to be immutable. There would be neither increase nor decrease in what we call the material object of faith; the sum of revealed truths would be constant, no new articles would be added, nor old lost. The consciousness of theologians might be dimmed; never the consciousness of the Church.

Hence the bidding of the Saviour must be interpreted strictly:

Going, therefore, make ye disciples (μαθητεύσατε) of all nations; baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them (διδάσκοντες) to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And lo, I am with you all days, even to the end of the world.[26] He that believeth and is baptised, shall be saved; he that believeth not, shall be damned.[27]

Note, the bidding of the Lord is not that the Apostles go to all nations and adapt their theology to the various circumstances they meet. It is not, "Teach them to observe whatsoever things ye wish"; but "Teach them to observe whatsoever

[25] Jo. 16:12-15.
[26] Mt. 28:19, 20.
[27] Mk. 16:16.

things I have commanded you". There is no "process of changing theology", no stewardship of faith by shifting with every wind of doctrine; but a firm stand on one deposit of faith, with a firmness that is guaranteed by the presence of Christ in his Church "even to the end of the world". Such is the stewardship of faith as established by Jesus Christ. Such is the stewardship of faith, we shall next month show, as it was understood by the Apostles. For they were true as true could be in their corporate union with Him. They fully believed, as St. Paul taught:

> He it is who granted some men to be Apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, some to be shepherds, and some to be teachers, for the fitting of the saints together,[28] for the business of the ministry, for the upbuilding of the body of Christ; till we shall attain to the unity of faith and full knowledge of the Son of God—unto the full man, unto the measure of the growth of the fulness of Christ.[29] And so we shall no longer be like babes; nor like little boats, tossed and twisted to and fro by every wind of doctrine, through the trickery of men and by their adroitness in devising error.[30]

Dr. Lake, in his Modernistic, eschatological, Christless and blasphemous form of so-called Christianity, is so twisted and turned from the truth by the trickery and adroitness of men from over the Rhine, that, using St. Paul's figure, we may aptly compare him to the little children who sail their toy boats upon the Boston Common. *Proh dolor*, however, the ideas that Dr. Lake has brought to Boston from Leiden are veritable submarines in their treacherous attacks on the Christianity of Jesus Christ and his Apostles.

WALTER DRUM, S.J.

Woodstock, Maryland.

[28] As part fitted to part in the human body.

[29] I. e., in the literal force of the words, "unto the full measure of the full growth of the fulness of the grace of Christ."

[30] Eph. 4: 11-14.

Criticisms and Notes.

IS SCHISM LAWFUL? A Study in Primitive Ecclesiology, with Special Reference to the Question of Schism. By the Rev. Edward Maguire, Maynooth College. B. Herder, St. Louis. 1915. Pp. 323.

THE NEW PELAGIANISM. By J. Herbert Williams. Sands & Co., London and Edinburg; B. Herder, St. Louis. Pp. 147.

As regards ideals and types, it is with the social body as it is with the individual person. The latter bears within himself at the very root of his nature the norm and pattern of moral life. Let him but look within himself and inquire there what he should do and be, and to his reflective eye will be revealed the type and the ideal. According to the measure of his insight and his intellectual culture—both powers conditioned by the purity and the justice of his life—will the picture of his true and typical self stand forth distinct and bold in his consciousness. So likewise is it with society, and, to narrow the term, Christian society in particular. Divine revelation, summed up principally in the Bible, had begotten in the social consciousness certain typical ideas of God and Christ, of the Church, the world, man, and the interrelations of all these central realities, and by examining the *exemplaria* we are in a position to discern what society, Christian society, actually is and ideally ought to be at any given moment of its existence. Unfortunately these typical forms of life, of thought as well as of deed, meshed in as they are with the decaying tissues of the social body, are liable to lose their concrete sanity. Abstractly they never change, but concretely they become modified by their setting. True pictures of the ideal, they are ever liable to grow faint and blurred in the corrosive atmosphere of sensuality and pride. The only way back to the truth is to take up the typical forms as they are conserved in the Sacred Writings and in the earlier and purer life of Christian society, and to compare the original exemplar with the present copy in actual prevalence. This process of comparison eventuates not only in a realization of the discrepancy between the copy and the type, but in a more perfect understanding of the original.

For confirmation of this dual gain the reader may be referred to the two works before us. The former is a study of the conception of the Church, as it is reflected on the one hand from the mind of Christ through the Gospels, and further manifested in the Apostolic

and the early Patristic writings; and on the other hand as it has grown into non-Catholic modern thought. The question, *Is Schism Lawful?* can of course be answered only in the negative, because, as the writer maintains, schism is not only disobedience to the supreme authority of the Church but *formal rebellion* against the same. If this be the essential nature of schism—and Dr. Maguire proves conclusively, it seems, that it is—then obviously it is never permissible. One may expatriate oneself, even as one may decline to be naturalized in the State wherein one has elected to dwell; but disloyalty to one's country or treason to the flag is always a crime. On the other hand, the heinousness of schism can be seen only by those who have the true conception that the Church is a unique and universal society having a divinely constituted authority vested primarily in the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter. That this is the genuine conception of the Church Dr. Maguire abundantly establishes, from the personal teaching of our Lord in the Gospels, from St. Paul's writings and from those of the early Fathers, SS. Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin, Irenæus, and Cyprian.

Those who think that, in view of the very large number of books on the Church already written, the addition of another to the long list looks very much like putting a nick in Occam's razor, have need to be reminded, in the words of Dr. Maguire, that at least "that portion of the treatise 'de Ecclesia' which professes to determine the extension of the Church has still to be treated scientifically". For, although "the question as to who are and who are not members of the body of Christ looks simple . . . one searches the handbooks in vain for a clear or satisfactory answer" (p. 287). Dr. Maguire here cites the well-known author of one of these handbooks as an example of a writer "who discusses the entire question of Church membership in the language of perplexity and indecision" (ib.). For the proofs of this charge we must refer the reader to the alleger of it. The controversy however is, it should be noted, incidental. The work is substantially a critico-historical study of the essence of the Church. And as such it is a valuable contribution to Ecclesiology, one which the student alike of history and of theology will do well to consult.

The New Pelagianism institutes a comparison between the old and the new standards on a larger range of subjects than does the foregoing volume, though with relatively less dwelling upon the single topic, the Church. Here it is the supreme subject, Eternal Salvation, that occupies the foreground, and the manifold speculations of the modern mind involved therein or related therewith are set over against the explicit teachings of the Bible and the Church.

The doctrine of eternal damnation has, it need hardly be said, passed entirely from the average non-Catholic's belief. "Among things needing to be altered in the Christian confession of faith or that might be allowed to pass into oblivion, the modernist only would not include the doctrine of Eternal Punishment, because it is already with the generality practically defunct," both in inward and in outward profession. But what is more to be noted is that "hell, as depicted in the Gospel, is found to be not merely an impossibility for belief; the belief in it is for our age an anachronism. The doctrine is taken over from Jews who burnt their children alive in sacrifice . . . its acceptance belongs to times when torture was still employed as a mode of punishment with civilized nations. All that is now over and gone." And so, "hell is disproved by being explained. If it was the reflection of its age, it is not the vision of eternity." How far away this is from the explicit teaching of Christ need not here be noted.

Of extremely practical significance is the author's observation on the mystery and the difficulty relative to the number of the saved conveyed by our Lord's behest: "Enter ye in at the narrow gate . . . for narrow is the gate and strait is the way that leadeth to life, and few there are that find it." Passing over the to most people seemingly strained interpretation of this passage which the modern mind —not excluding herefrom some Catholics — have placed upon the text, the comment subjoined by Mr. Williams ought not to be passed unnoticed. Let us allow, he says, that somehow or other it is not the majority who are lost. "But some are damned. If that is conceded, the most charitably disposed toward the class of wicked, would not object to the supposition of one in a thousand being damned, but would admit that the figure could not well be less, viewing the general language of the New Testament. Now the number of souls that have lived and died since the Christian era is calculated at not less than 17,000,000,000. One in a thousand would give the figure as 17,000,000. Then we should have to add the tale of pre-Christian centuries, which would perhaps equal or double the numbers, besides that if Christianity is anything there must be a greater proportionate number damned before than subsequently. But at any rate within the Christian period, 17,000,000. These souls are suffering the most horrible torments not for a thousand years . . . but for ever and ever, their living agony never ceasing, their torture enduring without a moment's ease for ages on ages, that imagination grows dizzy with fancying."

Let not the tenor of the foregoing passage be taken to indicate that the book before us is exhortatory either in matter or manner. The author puts his finger on not a few sore spots, sores that are

not confined to the non-Catholic body; and in several instances, as the one just cited, he does not omit to notice the fatality of the disorder.

But what is Neo-Pelagianism? it may be asked. Easily asked, it is inversely difficult to answer. Like Modernism, of which it is but another phase, it does not lend itself to definition. It falls within no category, has no genus or specific difference. It is an atmosphere, a spirit, breathing the *Zeit-geist*. In substance it is a denial of the supernatural, or rather a fusion of the natural into what used to be called the supernatural. A loosening of conviction in the reality as well as the necessity of grace. Not outright negation but only a genial ignoring of grace and faith. With us it is a child of Protestantism. "Viewing Protestants generally as invincibly ignorant, and therefore not to be condemned, it allows of an unrestrained intercourse with them, which is new to Catholic usage. The minds of Catholics are accordingly more affected than before by external influences; the new Pelagianism brings about the greater intimacy, and with the intimacy the new Pelagianism is more taken in, as are liberal ideas of whatever kind. Or no, they say; the doctrine of Christianity is confessed by the Church, by ourselves; it is the same as it always was. Is it? But it is viewed from another side; in practice it is a different thing. For example, if I say to myself, 'I do not know but that A.B. will be saved,' the spiritual condition of A.B. does not greatly concern me. I am content to let A.B. alone. But if I say to myself—what is only the obverse of the same proposition —'I do not know but that A.B. will be damned,' then the spiritual condition of A.B. is a continual and poignant anxiety to me, and especially if A.B. is a relation or a friend." And so, "with the new Pelagianism, there is less zeal for the conversion of souls . . . there is no large movement, no disturbance of men's minds, no wave that breaks on the shore," while the leakage is there "more in the calm than in the storm". From the foregoing extracts the reader will see that he has here to deal with a book that is timely, thoughtful, and earnest. The extent to which our comfort-loving age is gliding away from the stern realities of faith in a future life wherein heaven or hell are certainly the only alternatives, is pointed out, and the growing tendency to de-supernaturalize all revelation is made unmistakable. The book is not pessimistic. The greatest injury that could be done to its mission would be to call it so.

STRENGTH OF WILL. By E. Boyd Barrett, S.J., M. A. Hons. (Nat. Univ. of Ireland); D.Ph. (Louvain Univ.). P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1915. Pp. 263.

GRUNDFRAGEN DER PHILOSOPHIE UND PAEDAGOGIK fuer gebildete Kreise dargestellt. Von Dr. C. Williams, Professor der Philosophie im Priester-seminar zu Trier. I. Band: Das Sinnesleben, Seiten 550; II. Band: Das Geistesleben, Seiten 590. Trier, 1915: Druck & Verlag der Paulinus–Druckerei, G. m. b. H.

INSTITUTIONES PHILOSOPHICAE. Auctore C. Willems, S. Theologiae et Philosophiae Doctore, Philosophiae in Seminario Trevirensi Professore. Volumen I: Continens Logicam, Criticam, Ontologiam. Tertia editio. Treveris, 1915: ex Officina ad S. Paulinum.

Read upward from below, these three books will be seen to constitute a logical and fairly complete system both of the science, or philosophy, and the art of pedagogy. A consistent theory of education, if thorough, must in one sense be rooted in philosophy and in another sense philosophy must be its vital sap. The art of education may be said to begin and end in the training of the will. In the light of these dicta, such a work as Professor Willems's *Institutiones Philosophicae* supplies the rootage of a sound educational system. The volume introduced above is but the first portion of a revised edition of the whole work, the first edition of which has previously been reviewed in these pages. The changes consist chiefly in the compression of some of the theses of Ontology and in the expansion of the treatment of Truth, so as to take account of the recent speculations of Pragmatism and Monism. Aside from these features the third is substantially a rëimpression of the first edition. To those who are already acquainted with the work nothing further need be said. Those who see it now in title for the first time may be informed that these *Institutiones* have as features signalizing them in the large mass of cognate literature, remarkable erudition and likewise thoroughness of treatment, without prolixity. The author has not only thought out for himself, not simply compiled, his subject, but has read all around it. Consequently the references to and citations of collateral literature are frequent and abundant. The work is both scholarly and profound. Besides, it is lucid. Not that it is easy reading. It calls for vigorous thinking, the thinking that pays for itself. If we were to find any fault with the present volume, it would be that even the third edition contains a whole page of *corrigenda et addenda*. Nor does this much comprise all the oversights. A great big one stares out at you from the table of contents of the Ontology. Right there the printer seems to have been doing *penance!* Of course, Professor Willems is too busy a man to attend to these mechanical affairs, and the war has probably been hard on

the *Paulinus-Druckerei*. It may be hoped, however, that by the time the fourth edition is demanded, the international turmoils will have been quelled and the compositor enabled to do his work more tranquilly, and therefore more perfectly.

Passing upward from the Latin text-book to the German *Grundfragen*, we come to a work in which the philosophical truths established in the former work are further developed and applied to education. Two volumes are here. The first deals with the "sense-life"—the senses; the second with the "spirit-life"—the intellect and will. A third, in course of printing, will treat of the moral life. On the whole the work is unique, and so far as its form, plan, and mode of development are concerned, original. The material itself is substantially traditional. The author has taken the scholastic philosophy as he himself has wrought it out in his Latin work, recast and popularized it in his native German and developed its pedagogical aspects. The substance of the work was given as courses of lectures during two years to a class of teachers, and has therefore been practically tested by educators, who have requested its publication. Being philosophical pedagogy, or, if you will, pedagogical philosophy, naturally psychology and noetics stand in the front. These departments, being treated in the light of the neo-scholastic philosophy, embrace whatever fresh points of view and details of fact have been brought forward by recent experimental psychology. Nothing of importance within the latter domain is passed over. Thus, for instance, recent experimental studies of memory and imagination are discussed and their pedagogical value duly estimated. Dreams, hypnotism, mind-reading, telepathy—all these borderland and sometimes uncanny things come in for their due measure of consideration. Dr. Willems, it may not be so well known to merely English-speaking circles, brings to the present work special preparedness. His long experience as a teacher of philosophy has given him a comprehensive possession of fundamental truth and its significance for the all-round life of man—intellectual, moral, social. His likewise extended editorship of a clerical periodical similar to the present—*Der Seelsorger*—has perfected his natural insight into the practical bearings of truth on life, the life especially of the priest in his relations to the care of souls and the education of the young. His editorial work, moreover, has given him a directness, facility, and lucidity of expression which enable him to make even metaphysics almost easy and interesting—than which what feat could be greater! All these qualities are reflected from the present work in which the ripened fruit of the long years of tillage are garnered.

Coming now to the third, which is positionally the first, volume in the list above, we have a work whose title, inviting though it is, gives hardly a suggestion of the rich material compacted between the covers. One who has read Fr. Barrett's *Motive Force and Motivation Tracts* will be prepared to expect here points of view and suggestions of real practical value. And in this he will not be disappointed. But he will get more than he looked for. Genially but effectively he will be—no, not introduced to *himself*—that was done long ago, but—brought into closer touch with his own *will*. The book fixes a searchlight straight upon his central power. That power he will be helped to isolate; take firm hold of it, mold it, shape it, strengthen it, make it more his own. Of course all this he has been doing before. Who doesn't know that Catholic education has been precisely engaged in this thing for uncounted centuries; that every school boy and girl are all the time having their wills trained—the most powerful of all possible motives, the love and reverence of God, the promise of heaven and the threat of an eternal hell, being incessantly brought to bear upon their will through their mind, so that their wills, and thereby their selves, may be strengthened in righteousness? Yes, surely. All these things you should do, but omit not the rest. And the rest is the specific, specialized training of the will. You can train your fingers to fiddle; you can train your memory to seize and to hold; you can train your intellect to think; so too you can train your will to will. Suggestions looking to this training—methods, technique, exercises—these are here given. Besides this, you learn something more about the diseases of the will, about its relations on the one side to mind, on the other side to sensuality, feeling, motive, and so on. And, strange to say, you learn all this quickly and easily. This saying may to the mind of some be no advertisement of the book's value. Take it for what it's worth. It is meant simply to signify the author's felicity of exposition, and this because he is at home in his subject. Thoroughly familiar with what he teaches, he possesses equally the art of teaching it. In this sense his book is at once a theory and an art of education. It is pedagogy *simul docens et utens*. The reviewer has placed the book at the top of the list because it embodies the fruit of philosophy, or rather of psychology — psychology, however, as it has grown and developed by employing more extensively the recent experimental methods than was the wont in earlier times. For, as Fr. Barrett observes, some progress has been made in this direction. "The new pedagogy has unquestionably forged ahead and solved some minor problems. The art of training memory and imagination has been perfected, and very useful additions to our knowledge of the 'mind of the child' have been won." Moreover, in certain

" other directions the work of modern psychology has been far from fruitless; criminology, the study of nervous and mental diseases, hysteria, suggestion and hallucination, the 'psychology of the crowd' and of peoples, graphology, together with the psychology of mysticism—these and other fields of research have been tilled by psychologists with success. . . . Modern psychology renders our knowledge of the mind more clear, more complete, and more precise, besides of course extending it somewhat—and in this lies its *raison d'être*" (p. 228). "Now applying definite technical training to the will should result first of all in a clearer knowledge of this central energy and its various types—for there are will-types just as there are memory-types—as well as its disorders or diseases." Without being over-sanguine as to the future of will-psychology, Fr. Barrett thinks it not unlikely that "will-training would have a beneficial effect in curing or partly curing many maladies of the nerves. Even mental diseases might thereby be banished. . . ." Nor "does it seem too much to say that some good might be wrought in prisons, among criminals (among those especially whose religion is a negligible quantity) by teaching them how to exercise their power of self-restraint, and how to control their passions by the natural powers of the mind". Will-culture therefore is meant obviously to be the natural auxiliary, the *ancilla*, of religion. By pointing out definitely its sphere of service and by indicating its methods, Fr. Barrett's book will contribute not a little toward the development of this insufficiently cultivated department of psychology and pedagogy.

THE BLESSED PEACE OF DEATH. A Little Book of Good Cheer. Adapted from the German of the Rev. Augustine Wibbelt. New York: Joseph F. Wagner. 1915.

The author of the book here presented in English dress, Dr. Wibbelt, who has also written under the pseudonym "Ivo", is one of those rare geniuses who combine the poetical with a keen sense of the practical, and who know how to give to both a spiritual tone that makes the eternal dominate in all his literary productions. His Rhenish dialect stories are field-flowers of the heart, in which humor is joined to native virtue to delight the unspoiled taste for the natural. His poetry has the fine flavor of the moral. His devotional books speak from and to the heart of the child and the religious.

His *Blessed Peace of Death* (Trostbuechlein vom Tode) is a gathered sheaf of observations by the roadside of life, that brings home to the soul the thought of death, not as the gloom of an unknown country, or as the end of all things, but as a blessed hope that makes one more ready to shoulder the burden anew, and to steady

one's step toward the attainment of the one thing worth while. There are not many books bearing the label "Preparation for Death", that one likes to give to a person sick with the lingering forebodings of death, because life and health are things to be prized as opportunities for gaining merit under the mercy of God; and because with most sufferers the thought of denied recovery brings on the despondency that still more shortens life. Besides, most men shrink from the approach of death, however clearly they perceive it to be the beginning of an eternal retribution that ends in happiness for the well disposed. But here is a little book that familiarizes the reader with the eternal things which he must face some day, without frightening him. They are random reflections, elicited by what the traveler in life sees about him, little stories, incidents, scenes, under the title of "Greetings and Responses", "Aspects", "Anxieties", "Consecration", "Life", with subtitles that elicit interest and curiosity, all of which gives a sort of festive echo to the thought of death. The translation is very good, inasmuch as it does not slavishly turn the words from one dictionary into the other, but rather renders the idiom in familiar expressions of thought and sentiment.

It is a little book; but it is worth much as a companion in the sick-room and for hours when men are disposed to reflect on the values of life.

THE LIFE OF FATHER DE SMET, S.J. (1801–1873). By E. Laveille, S.J. Authorized translation by Marian Lindsay. Introduction by Charles Coppens, S.J. Illustrated. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1915. Pp. xxii—400.

Father De Smet belongs to that heroic band of apostles who, taking the Master at His word, leave all things and follow Him in the quest for souls. Reckoning naught of the *quid erit nobis*, he tore himself from home and kindred, severing almost violently every domestic tie and escaping secretly from his father's house, lest leave-taking should prove stronger than the divine call to the mission field in the Western World. Many who abandon home and kindred get the hundredfold even in kind—a humble house is exchanged for a stately mansion and rude companionship for cultured society. It was the other way about with the youth De Smet. From comfortable surroundings he passed to the indescribable hardship of the pioneer settlement, from refined association to the rude wigwams of disgusting savages. Across Maryland on foot from Whitemarsh to Wheeling; down the Ohio on an open scow to the Mississippi; thence a tramp of 180 miles across Missouri over the bottom lands inundated by the spring freshets, wading often waist-deep through

the water and mire, seldom finding shelter in farm or inn, forced to be content with barn or stable, the singing and the biting mosquitoes making sleep an impossibility—these are a few features of young De Smet's first journey in the land of his adoption, the initial stage of those toilsome travels which in the half-century of his missionary career were to comprise some two hundred and sixty-one thousand miles, more than ten times the girdle of the earth. It is not unlikely, indeed, that these figures are somewhat, or rather that they certainly are, exaggerated (as might easily be proved from some of the computations given in the volume before us), since Father De Smet in his first journeys was often obliged to form but rough estimates of distances. Nevertheless, making all due allowances, one can reach some conception of what the missionary's travels meant, what hardships they entailed during the second and third quarter of the last century, when means of locomotion were not what they since have become.

All these journeyings and hardships had of course but one end in view, the conversion of the savage Indian. For this he braved the torrid deserts of the West, scaled the Rocky Mountains, shot the perilous rapids of the swollen rivers, buffeted the icy torrents, slept roofless under the skies, ate the nauseating food of the savages, nursed the victims of cholera and smallpox—in a word, made himself all things to all men, the most degraded of men, that he might gain all men to Christ. Eight voyages he made to Europe to beg in foreign capitals aid for his poor Indians.

Father De Smet was a modest man, but now and again, like St. Paul, he speaks of himself, or rather of his trials, though then even with the *insipienter dico* as apology. Writing to a fellow-missionary, he says: "I, too, have tasted the bitter privations to which one is exposed in the Indian countries. Let me tell you some of them. For several years I was a wanderer in the wilderness and during three years I never received a single letter. I lived for two years in the mountains without ever tasting bread, coffee, tea, or sugar. During four years neither shelter [this probably in some qualified sense] nor bed; for six months I was without underlinen and often, days and nights, I have gone without food or drink. Pardon me if I speak thus, and believe me I do so neither to reproach you nor to glorify myself. I only recall what I have endured. Nor do I regret it. On the contrary, I thank God for it . . ." (p. 222). And what was the result of it all? The answer to this question is in part given by the work before us, wherein much of what Father De Smet accomplished amongst the Indians as well as in the settlements of the whites is graphically described. The greater part of it, however, must of course remain hidden to mortal eye and await the final assizes of humanity to be made manifest.

It were easier to estimate the causes than to sum up the effects of this great missionary's labors. If there was ever a patent illustration of the *gratia supponit naturam*, it was Father De Smet. Providence, intending to make an apostle, first made a man. Physically, De Smet was a Hercules. Some of the feats of strength narrated in the present volume try one's belief. He is said, for instance, to have bitten a copper coin in twain in order to give the half as a souvenir to his youthful companion from whom he was about to part. He is described, when a lad, as seizing on the playgrounds a bully of greater bulk than himself, doubling him up in his arms and carrying him off to a pond, in which he dipped the ruffian. It would be interesting to know just what the bully was doing in the meantime with his hands and feet! At all events his unusual physical strength gained for him amongst his companions the nickname, Samson. His powerful and agile frame encased a soul wherein a many-sided intelligence was associated with a determined will and a deep and enduring affection. A naturalist of no mean ability, he was acquainted with the manifold forms of plant and animal life which he found in field and forest. A lover of nature, the beauties of the physical universe touched his inmost soul and elicited the sentiments of admiration and love which he manifests in his letters. His letters, moreover, reveal an affectionate heart which he pours forth in the communications with his father and brothers and sisters and friends. Single in purpose, his whole character was lightsome. Child-like, he loved children and youth, who quickly knew and loved him in turn. Amiable, affable, unselfish, he drew to the cause of his Master both young and old, Indian and white, soldiers, officers, statesmen, priests, religious: all were attracted by his magnetic personality. Add to these natural gifts of body and soul, mind and heart, the ardent love, burning zeal, unwearying patience, utter sacrifice of self—and you have the forces in De Smet's character which explain his great accomplishments as an apostolic missionary. For the rest, if the reader would know the hero as he deserves to be known, let him go to this new biography. The book is worthy of its subject. Well documented from the abundant sources at the writer's control, sympathetic in spirit, fluent and pleasing in style, translated into genuine English, the work is one that every educated Catholic should read. To the laity it will be an inspiration, to the clergy and religious an encouragement and the portrayal of an exemplar.

PIONEER LAYMEN OF NORTH AMERICA. By the Rev. T. J. Campbell, S.J. Vol. II. The America Press, New York. Pp. 339.

There is a particular charm in things youthful. Romance clings round the beginnings of everything, whether it be an individual or a

nation or a country. The early history of every country, therefore, is replete with romantic and stirring incidents, the reading of which furnishes more genuine and more wholesome excitement than novels with their artificial plots and puzzling problems. It is well to look back to those days of superb manhood and splendid virility, and to follow the trail of the men that blazed the path of civilization through impenetrable wilds and laid the foundations of our present greatness. Father Campbell has given us a delightful and instructive book; its pages sparkle and bristle with romance; its perusal has a tonic and bracing effect; for, here adventure comes unbidden in the pursuit of noble, or at least great, aims. Truly, the men whom he describes are not all saints; but they are strong and sculptured on an heroic scale; they are fascinating in their ruggedness, in their straightforwardness and singleness of purpose. This volume contains sketches of such intrepid pioneers as Le Moyne, Perrot, D'Iberville, Frontenac, La Salle, Bienville, La Verendrye, and Dr. John McLoughlin.

The narrative interest of these sketches must not make us forget their historical value. They are based on a critical and thorough study of original sources wherever such were available; hence they afford a correct view of the period described. Not the least merit of the volume is that it corrects misconceptions and misrepresentations due to religious prejudice, which, in some instances, has spread utterly false impressions concerning the heroes of the pioneer days. Both the historian and the casual reader will welcome this book; to the Catholic layman it will prove a source of inspiration.

JOHN BANISTER TABB, THE PRIEST-POET. By M. S. Pine. Published for the Georgetown Visitation Convent by Munder-Thomsen Co., New York and Baltimore. Pp. 153.

Perhaps some day, when the world decides to pay its debts, Father Tabb may live anew in full and minute biographies, but he will hardly be more like himself than in this vivid little sketch. We have him here as he was in the flesh. His simple career, his character, his many moods, even his whims, his crotchets and his quaint humors, are set before us in a few free-hand but graphic strokes. It is a brief story, sincerely told; and those that knew him best will find in it scarcely a false or misleading detail. One might liken it to a clear-cut stencil-picture, which one's own memories or one's own reflections serve to color and complete.

In the production of the life, the self-revelations of the poet's lines have been largely pieced together, eked out with inklings of his personal history and nature furnished by his friends. The style is

brisk, fresh and pictorial. The tone is one of enthusiastic, but perhaps not unmeasured, admiration. To be sure, there is throughout the book an ardent zeal for the fame of Father Tabb; but the glow it sheds on every event and every judgment does not distort the truth, but only bathes it in the brightness of warm feeling and human interest. We may question, indeed, if any outline of a good man's doings and writings, drawn without this light of sympathy, would not be altogether dim and colorless.

In addition to a speaking likeness of the poet's self, we find in the book a choice selection of his verse. Samples of his finest work are spread before us in judicious variety. Now the deep pools, and now the twinkling foam of the torrent of his thought come into view as we make our pleasant way along the pages. The author of the life has a keen and eloquent sense of the loveliness and power of the poet's song, and knows how to set them forth to good advantage. Some of Father Tabb's most fervent admirers may find in his poems, thus skilfully arranged, more diversity and merit than they thought were truly his. They may realize at length that his poetry is not, as has been too often inconsiderately said, only for the few and thoughtful, but rather for the many that feel and love religion and beauty.

By a happy grouping of the poems around several central themes, winding paths, so to say, are laid out in the poet's garden, from which we closely see many a grace and fairness that went unnoticed before, or was hardly distinguished amid the clustered charms. Down these flowery ways the biographer leads us, and points out beauties to us, and tells us their symbolism. There is an interpretation of the poet's meaning at every step; but this running commentary, though clearly the result of much reflection and study, has nothing about it far-fetched or pedantic. It is a simple and loving recital of how these lines affect one reader.

The writer, we may think, has caught the dominant note of Father Tabb's song. The sub-title alone would intimate that. "Priest-Poet" is the combination of the two words that is less familiar and less musical, but more expressive of the truth. Father Tabb, first and last, was a priest that was a poet. Faith was the soul of his poetry; worship its form. He sang to the Lord all his life. But indeed in a sense all true poetry is a priesthood. The bard is a priest of nature, anointed with the oil of inspiration, sacrificing the first fruits of beauty to the God of the rain and the snow.

Another striking feature of Father Tabb's muse, its lyrical temper, is likewise set forth. His poems indeed are essentially songs. They lilt; they dance on the tongue to tunes all their own. They sing as children sing at play. But the motive of their song is always

intensity of soul, never tranquillity. Each lay is a rhapsody, eager and vehement. Like the mourner of *In Memoriam* the poet did but sing because he must. Under the stress of urgent emotion, he seems breathless, impatient of the restraint of words, and it might seem to some, speechless, in the effort to ease his heart of its feelings. Yet, again, is not all this merely the blaze of the true poetic fire? Is not this only "the struggle with an ideal truth" that Keble considered intrinsic to poetry?

In form as well as matter the book is attractive. It is bound in green and gold, with no little good taste as to fitness and elegance. Two portraits of the poet appear. One is a photograph, the other a sketch by himself, which, far from being a caricature, is a proof of how the pencil may vie with the sun in hitting off true likenesses. Appended to the biography are a characteristic sermon by Father Tabb, and the memorable funeral eulogy pronounced over him by the Reverend Daniel J. Connor, S.T.L., of Scranton, Pa. Altogether the work is worthy of the large sale that we are told it has had already. It is in its second edition. This uncommon success doubtless assures the founding of the "Father Tabb Memorial Scholarship" at St. Charles's College, Maryland, to which purpose the profits from the publication of the life are generously devoted.

THE RECONCILIATION OF GOVERNMENT WITH LIBERTY. By John W. Burgess, Ph.D., Ju.D., LL.D. Scribner & Sons, New York. 1915. Pp. 410.

The problem of conciliation between the warring tendencies of a man's own personal experience finds its counterpart in the problem of adjustment between the claims of the individual and those of society. Every one bears within himself testimony to the battle waging in his own bosom between sensuous desire on the one side and the ideals of the spirit on the other. St. Paul's lament on "the double law in his members", the conflict of death from which he prays for deliverance, does but voice the *video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor* in which the universal experience of humanity is summed up; while the story of the efforts to reduce to a system the means and measures whereby the conflicting tendencies may be harmonized and brought under the unity of rational law, is the story of all ethics or moral philosophy. So, too, on the other hand, has it been the search of the ages "to construct a system wherein the tendencies of the individual may be harmonized with the best interests of the social system in which Government and Liberty shall be reconciled, in which each of these all-comprehending means of civilization shall strengthen the other and in which each shall be the

fulfilment of the other". The "millenial equilibrium" is as yet far from our doors or our shores and the foreshadowings of its approach are not seen on the horizon. Nevertheless, if ever it is to come, it will depend largely, if not entirely, on what use will be made of the gathered experience of history. If it were possible for men to see just what organized States have done, what success and what failure have accompanied their efforts, whence have come the one and the other—if it were given men to see all this synthetically, the approach to a workable equilibrium might be hastened. For thus at least one condition upon which the hope of balancing things depends would have been established.

A contribution to some such survey is furnished by the work before us. Taking up in turn each grand division of the race, the author asks what have been its conciliatory efforts. First of Asia—China, Japan, Persia, Turkey—and Africa (Bk. I); next of Europe—Ancient Greece and Rome, Germania, the Frankish Kingdom, the Carolingian Empire, the Anglo-Saxon State, the Middle Ages, the Revived Monarchy, the Revolution, and the present European States (Bk. II); lastly, what have been the efforts of America—the United States, South America, Mexico, Central America, the West Indies (Bk. III). The survey, it will thus appear, is immense and seemingly beyond the compass of so relatively small a volume to comprise. On the other hand, it should be noted in the first place that the author's long experience as a student and teacher of Political Science has familiarized him with the historical tendencies of governments; and in the second place, the work is not meant to be a universal history, but simply a survey of national efforts to attain one thing, even though that one thing is the essential and primary business of organized States. That Professor Burgess has succeeded so well in an undertaking as vast as it is important, is a matter for congratulation. The synthesis he offers is on the whole both clear and comprehensive. The spirit pervading the work is objective and impartial. Even in the summing-up of the difficult and delicate subject of the interrelations between Church and State during the Middle Ages and the still more befogged period of the Reformation, the treatment is unusually fair and discriminating. A Protestant of course can hardly be expected to see these things precisely as they were. For instance, when we read at page 169 that "the divine origin of the Papal supremacy and of the temporal power of the Papacy was denied and disproved," we notice an example of confusion both of subjects and of predicates, a specimen of the *fallacia compositionis* which a competent Catholic scholar could not make. Again we read at page 174: "Instead of the Universal Roman Catholic Church there existed after 1650 the National Catholic

Churches of Spain, France, Austria, Poland, etc. more subject to the Royal supremacy than to the Papal, not, however, so completely as in England." This is obviously an exaggeration. There never existed in the countries mentioned, least of all in Spain, any National Catholic Church. There would not have existed any such contradictorially-named organization even in England had it not been for the lechery of Henry VIII. Other similar misstatements might be noticed here and there. The author's intention, however, to be just is patent and his success in this respect is noteworthy. In connexion with the portion of the volume treating of the Middle Ages, the reader would do well to consult Barry's *Papal Monarchy* (New York: Putnam). Grisar's *Luther* (St. Louis: Herder) might profitably *accompany* the perusal of the chapter on the Reformation.

As regards the problem of adjustment in our own country, Professor Burgess's opinion deserves mention. "We are further away to-day," he thinks, "from the solution of the great problem . . . than we were twenty years ago. In principle we have too much Government and in practice too slack and irregular execution of the law." And then, after outlining the conditions required for reconciliation, he alludes to "a School of Sociologists and Political Economists . . . who, impatient of the voluntary methods of religion, charity and philanthropy, have sought to accomplish what they call social justice, the social uplift, by governmental force", and to solve "by force the problems of the social relations heretofore regulated by influence, by religion, conscience, charity and human feeling, the substitution of the club of the policeman for the crosier of the priest, the supersession of education, morals, and philanthropy by administrative ordinance". All this may be necessary, he thinks, "but is it progress in civilization? May there not be a better way, a more American way?" The way would include "a revival of religion and morals, a rëestablishment of the influence and functions of the Churches, and an improvement of our system of education". Truly, this were a better way, but a way which has become more and more impracticable because of the decay of religious faith and the divorce of religion from education.

PROGRESSIVE LESSONS IN HEBREW WITH EXERCISES AND VOCABULARY. By the Rev. Romain Butin, S. M., Ph.D. The Catholic Education Press, Washington, D. C. 1915. Pp. xvi, 248.

KEY TO THE PROGRESSIVE LESSONS IN HEBREW. By the Rev. R. Butin, S. M., Ph.D. The Catholic Education Press, Washington, D. C. Pp. 42.

Our ordinary Hebrew Grammars fail to give proper help to our students: they are either too elementary, not giving a true idea of the language, or too elaborate and theoretical, discouraging the student by innumerable details. Dr. Butin's *Progressive Lessons* avoid both defects. Following an eminently practical method, he aims at being sufficiently complete so as to enable the students to read the common Hebrew text with profit and satisfaction. Moreover, if after studying the *Progressive Lessons,* they wish to consult larger grammars such as Kautzsch, König, etc., they will be well prepared to do so without running the danger of being drowned in the mass of philological and critical remarks.

Dr. Butin's book begins with a rather comprehensive Introduction, the chief points of which are to be understood at the very outset, the rest to be learned when referred to in the subsequent pages. The Grammar itself is divided into twenty-four Lessons. Each Lesson opens with a vocabulary of well-chosen words. The main body of the Lesson is taken up by the rules of morphology and syntax, with numerous examples as illustration. The syntactical, and sometimes also the morphological part is preceded by a set of phrases and sentences embodying the main rules to be explained; these will prove of great service both in memorizing and in reviewing. The last part of the Lesson is given to Exercises both on morphology and syntax. The grammar is followed with Paradigms, well selected and put together with great care and much practical sense. The last part of the book consists of two Glossaries, one Hebrew with references to the Lessons in which the respective words occur, and the other English-Hebrew. A comprehensive Logical Index is added, enabling professor and students to review the whole grammar systematically in a second reading.

The Key is not merely a translation of the Exercises, but contains valuable, although short, suggestions on the method of studying the Grammar. As a most welcome addition, the author has given in the form of an Appendix to the Key a sketch of Hebrew Nominal Formation, which will give the student an insight into the forms and attendant meaning of Hebrew nouns.

Every professor using Dr. Butin's Grammar faithfully will harvest excellent results in his class, no matter whether he follows the synthetical or the analytical method, whether he goes over the lessons as they are in the Grammar, or whether he prefers to start with the examples and exercises and then proceed with the explanation of the rules. That is just one of the good points in Dr. Butin's Grammar, that it leaves every professor entirely free to follow any method of his own and fully supplies him with the necessary materials, whatever method he may choose. Even a student who studies Hebrew

without a teacher, is certain to get the best of results out of it, provided he uses the Key simultaneously; the Key, for one who studies Hebrew privately, is as important as the Grammar itself.

In the Annual Report of the Rector of the Catholic University for 1915, competent critics are quoted as declaring the *Progressive Lessons in Hebrew* to be the best practical Hebrew Grammar extant. After having examined this work very carefully, by far more carefully than is usually done even by conscientious reviewers, we do not hesitate to subscribe to that judgment. The arrangement is practical, the wording concise, the explanation scientific and solid; the rules are simplified and yet clear and complete, the exercises abundant and instructive.

Although the books were printed in Germany during the war, and thus reading of the proof-sheets could be effected only with great difficulties, there are relatively few typographical errors, certainly none that cannot easily be corrected by the professor and even by attentive students.

The art and care with which the books have been printed by the press of W. Drugulin, in Leipzig, deserve every credit. The typography and make-up are simply perfect.

Dr. Butin has dedicated his book to the Catholic University on the occasion of its twenty-fifth anniversary. We wish to offer our congratulations to the University on such a worthy expression of veneration and affection; and we hope most sincerely that Dr. Butin's excellent work will find its way into the hands of all theological students of all creeds and denominations.

THE ARMAGH HYMNAL. A Collection of Hymns and Translations compiled by Shane Leslie, King's College, Cambridge, and John Stratford Collins, St. John's College, Cambridge. The Music edited by W. H. Grattan Flood, Mus.D., National University of Ireland. Dublin: Catholic Truth Society of Ireland. 1915. Cloth, 133 pages, small quarto.

The fact that this volume does not include the O Salutaris Hostia and that it gives but one musical setting to the Tantum Ergo (which is not printed separately, but only in connexion with the Pange Lingua) is perhaps a sufficient indication that the design of the editors is rather to supplement than to replace any existing hymnals by the present one. The volume is not, indeed, an ordinary hymnal. One may reasonably surmise that it has practically a missionary scope with an ideal purpose, namely, to exhibit a type or standard of what a Catholic hymnal should be in respect both of literary excellence in the texts and of hymnodal appropriateness in their musical settings.

In the initial essay entitled "Ad Perpetuam Rei Memoriam", the original editors make it clear that the volume is not intended for immediate popular use:

> This hymnal has been prepared for schools and colleges rather than for popular use, and represents a desire on the part of the compilers to see in the noblest of services, the best words of the English vernacular set in the best order, more consistently than has appeared in many modern collections. The compilers have no other ambition than to add an Irish companion to the admirable Scottish Book of Hymns with which Dom Gregory Ould has recently answered the challenge which the "Bishop's Hymnal" seemed to offer to the taste of English-speaking Catholics.

Meanwhile, as the Musical Editor very well remarks in his Preface, "no rivalry with existing hymnals is sought"; and the volume may therefore be properly considered more of a helper than of a rival to Father Gaynor's excellent *St. Patrick's Hymn Book,* the new and revised edition of which was published in Dublin in 1906. The two volumes have a different scope, as the latter appealed (in a dignified and hymnodal fashion, however) to popular support, while *The Armagh Hymnal* has been prepared rather for schools and colleges.

Upon the death of Mr. Collins, who had "planned the Hymns and Music", the musical editorship of the book was entrusted to Dr. Flood, who adds to the long initial essay of the original editors a briefer but more detailed account of the outstanding features of the volume, declaring *inter alia*:

> No rivalry with existing hymn-books is sought, but an attempt is made to give a literary standard to the lyrics, and to present a work that may be regarded as Catholic yet National. Verses by Richard Rolle, the fourteenth-century mystic, by Southwell, Crashaw, Faber, Newman, Bridges, Caddell, Clarence Mangan, de Vere, Father Matthew Russell, S.J., Emily Hickey, Father Tabb, and Francis Thompson, need no commendation. . . . The Breviary Hymns are well represented, and due prominence is given to Gregorian Plainsong, with selections from the Sarum and York uses. There are also some magnificent hymns of the Greek Church and of the Syriac Church, in suitable translations. Our own Irish Church is represented by hymns attributed to St. Patrick, St. Columcille, St. Cucuimne, St. Oengus, and St. Sechnall (Secundinus), while the beautiful "Sancti Venite", from the Bangor Antiphonary, finds a place. The traditional pilgrim hymns of Lough Derg, of Lourdes, and of the Irish Pontifical Zouaves, will doubtless be acceptable, as well as some Irish traditional hymns; there are also original lyrics by Mr. Shane Leslie, Father John O'Connor, and Dom Bede Camm, O.S.B.

The Index of Composers illustrates the breadth of view exercised in the selection of tunes. Music is international; but had it been at all possible to have combined hymnal appropriateness with excellence of melodic inspiration, doubtless we should have had a larger selection of airs by native Irish composers. These have been exceptionally fecund in the abundance, originality, and inspirational excel-

lence of their melodies, which have, even in a musical sense, made of Ireland the "Land of Song". A hymnal, however, demands a peculiar type of musical appropriateness for the sacred lyrics that are to be sung. Here we cannot surmise any fault of oversight or omission on the part of the Musical Editor, whose long and fruitful studies in the realm of Irish melody have for many years past illustrated his minute and comprehensive grasp of this subject. Indeed, he himself contributes five new and original tunes, four of which are, most appropriately, settings to hymns of a distinctively Irish source or flavor.

The volume contains 150 hymns, of which 67 are translations (49 from the Latin, 10 from the Greek, 4 from the Irish, 2 from the Syriac, and one each from the French and the Italian). In such a brief compass the editors have endeavored, with notable success, to illustrate all kinds of sacred lyrical genius. Their aim has been high, their task has been onerous, their labors have been zealous. Withal, they modestly declare that, in addition to the difficulty of discriminating between the hymn and the merely sacred poem, their attempt, within a slender compass, to make the hymnal Catholic and yet National, has resulted in "a compromise in more ways than one". All this disarms criticism save such as may be made from the standpoint of appreciation and helpfulness. The few comments a reviewer may offer here are therefore intended to be helpful toward a betterment in any forthcoming revision of the volume. First, then, we venture to think that some of the adaptations of text to melody might be improved by slight alterations in the texts, in order to have a concurrence of the musical and the metrical accent throughout. We venture also to think that, in a hymnal with such a high literary aim, the rhyming might be improved in a few instances. Thus in No. 71 we find "pleaders" rhyming with "heed us"; in No. 75, we find such "rich rhymes" as *procession, session, possession* in the first stanza, and *confusion, profusion, fusion,* in the second, etc.; in No. 134, *high* is rhymed with *aye* (meaning "ever"); in No. 146, we find *make me* and *create me, descended* and *cleansèd,* etc. Again, Dr. Grattan Flood's task was made needlessly onerous by oversights of the Literary Editor. We find, for instance, that the fifth line of the third stanza of No. 14 has an iambic foot in excess of the metre. This is true also of the first line of No. 93. On the other hand, the third line of the third stanza of No. 73 lacks an iambic foot necessary for the music and the metre. Finally, a few misprints may be mentioned: In No. 5, the second chord of the fifth measure omits C. In No. 6, the last chord has E-flat instead of D. It would seem preferable to print the word "Of" at the end of the third line (first stanza of

Clamor Ecclesiae, page 21) instead of at the beginning of the fourth line, in order that it shall be in agreement with the barring of the music. In No. 43, the bass-note of the chord going with *ni* of *Veni* should be G (instead of A). In No. 109, we think it would be proper to print the first and third lines of every stanza in alignment, in order to indicate their perfect metrical agreement; for the hymn is far from being that "rugged and unpoetical" thing surmised by Dr. J. M. Neale. In the seventh stanza of this hymn, *set* (fourth line) should of course be *est.*

While all this minute criticism may be useless to the editors (who doubtless have already noticed the *corrigenda* in the printed page), it may be of some service to purchasers of the volume, who will find the suggested corrections easy of insertion at the places indicated. It remains for us to compliment the editors on their achievement and to express our pleasure at the attractive style in which, from a merely material standpoint, the volume has been issued by the publishers. H. T. H.

KYRIALE, seu Ordinarium Missae, Missa pro Defunctis, Toni Communes Missae, et Varii Cantus usitati ad Processionem et Benedictionem SS. Sacramenti. According to the Vatican Version. Modern Notation with Rhythmical Signs.

THE SAME, in Gregorian Notation with Rhythmical Signs. J. Fischer & Brother, New York. 1915.

The "Varii Cantus" mentioned in the sub-title above are the Te Deum and the hymns in honor of the Blessed Sacrament to be found in the Appendix of the original Vatican Gradual, with the addition of the Magnificat, in the eighth tone.

The rhythmical signs are those of the Solesmes editions of the official chants. They are intended to aid singers who are not so well versed in the intricacies of Gregorian rhythm as to be able to interpret the melodies without some direction of this kind, and also to lighten the work of a choirmaster, who otherwise would be obliged, even with experienced singers, to indicate the details in places where a difference of opinion as to interpretation might exist.

The little books are well bound, very convenient in size, and should prove very serviceable. In the matter of clearness, however, the Gregorian notation leaves something to be desired. The notes are rather small, in the longer neums so close together as to require good, sharp eyes to distinguish them quickly. The Quilisma, especially, could be very much improved. The modern notation is quite good. J. A. B.

Literary Chat.

In a neat volume of some sixty pages, entitled *Newman's Gentleman*, Dr. O'Donnell, professor of English at Notre Dame University, makes an analysis of Cardinal Newman's often-quoted definition of a gentleman. It is a study for the class-room, and sets forth that Newman's true mind on the gentleman is not simply that of the man of cultivated intellect, fine taste, candor, and courteous manner, but all these things only when based upon the principle of religious motive. Newman wanted to contrast secular and true education by emphasizing the defect of University training without religion. We fancy that most Catholic writers or teachers when they cite to their Catholic pupils the words of Newman as an example of the ideal gentleman, simply wish to bring out the fact that natural virtue should be the substratum of supernatural virtue, such as Catholics aim to possess. Newman was arguing for the Catholic character of a University, and needed only to reverse the sequence of his proposition in order to apply it to the Catholic student who seeks religion there while possibly neglecting to cultivate the gifts and graces of nature. (Longmans, Green & Co.)

The Secret Bequest by Christian Reid is a beautiful story of conversion to the Faith. It pictures the struggles and sacrifices of a young heiress, whose true title to a large estate is made dependent on her sincere efforts, given in a secret codicil of the will, to alienate from the Catholic religion a near relative who, but for his own conversion, should have been the legal heir. A double romance runs through the story, the scene of which is laid partly in New York, partly in the South. The Benedictine Abbey of Belmont, in North Carolina, furnishes the opportunity and theatre for an exposition of the solemn ceremonial of Corpus Christi. The edifying sight of the Eucharistic procession becomes the occasion of an inquiry that leads a naturally intelligent and noble mind, contrary to her worldly instincts, into the Catholic Church. The characters of the novel are well drawn and true to nature. We owe this admirable piece of work, next to the author's love for her art and zeal for religion, to the *Ave Maria*, which means Father Hudson, who has published it in serial first and now attractively in book form.

Some people think we are getting too many books about Socialism. All the books we already have say pretty much the same things, viz., that Socialism is atheistical, immoral, an enemy to the individual, family, and the State—and so on. All this everybody already knows or knows that most Socialists deny it or that Socialists who admit it don't care what you say for or against them. They are unamenable to argument, and precisely because they are quite sure you don't and can't understand Socialism. You are a capitalist wedded to the capitalist State, and unable to see or appreciate the Socialist plans of reformation.

Perhaps this is the point of view of those who are at home in the literature of the Socialist polemics—who know pretty much what is to be said and what has been said for and against Socialism. Others who are not so well informed will welcome a new book in which the objections against Socialism are restated. Especially will this be so if the arguments are framed in an easy, straightforward style such as Mr. B. V. Hubbard has adopted in a recent volume entitled *Socialism, Feminism, and Suffragism* (pp. 301; Chicago: American Publishing Co.).

Mr. Hubbard brings to bear against Socialism the line of argument indicated above, but, as we have just said, his direct and forceful style should gain for his critique a hearing with those readers especially who are apt to have felt the influence of a not dissimilar mode of address from the Socialist platform. Moreover, two-thirds of his book have to do with *Feminism and Suffragism*, the twin sisters of Socialism. Against both these excesses of

recent womanish propaganda he has many strong things to say. Healthy and sound they are, too, and needed to be said with the unmistakable directness given them here. This is particularly true of his observations on feminism in the school. Did space permit, we would like to quote a specimen or two. We must, however, refer the reader to the book itself, where he will find some pithy paragraphs for reflection.

It is hardly necessary to note that all advocates of votes for women are neither *Feminists* nor *Suffragists* in the opprobrious sense that owing to the excesses of the *Suffragettes* has fallen upon these terms. There are not a few thoughtful and far-seeing churchmen—bishops and priests—who favor woman's political emancipation. The closing chapter in the first volume of *Addresses at Patriotic and Civic Occasions by Catholic Orators*, recently compiled and published by Joseph Wagner (New York), is an instance in point. Bishop Dowling's well-known lecture is properly given a place in this collection of Catholic oratory.

A propos of this matter we might note in passing that, in view of the epithet *in sexu fragili* occurring in the prayer "pro virgine martyre", it is hardly correct to say that "it is not Christian thought which sanctioned the expression 'the weaker sex'" (p. 285). Moreover, no less Christian a writer than St. Bernard justifies the idea by putting it into the mind of the wisest of men, Salomon: "Noverat quippe vir sapiens hujus sexus infirmitatem, fragile corpus, lubricam mentem." (Hom. in *Missus.*) The epithet *fragile* is of course not as complimentary as is *fair*, and no good can come from "rubbing it in". On the other hand, no ultimate gain can come from ignoring or understating the providential order of things. For the rest, we very warmly recommend the collection of addresses which has occasioned the foregoing remark. It contains a considerable variety of subjects suitable for almost every occasion, civic and patriotic. The addresses emanate from eminent Catholic orators, clerical and lay. A priest having occasion to speak before a civic gathering is apt to find in them suggestive thoughts which, letting loose the flood-gates of his own eloquence, will leave him independent. The volumes are strongly bound and neatly boxed.

The nearest approach to the ideal manner of hearing Mass is to follow prayer by prayer the *Ordo Missae*. From this point of view the *New Missal in English* should and will prove a great help to Catholic worship, if the clergy instruct the faithful how to use that wonderful instrument. Devotion, however, is so largely conditioned by personal traits and acquired habits that no one single method will appeal to every soul. A little book has recently appeared from the pen of Fr. Roche, S.J., entitled *Mysteries of the Mass in Reasoned Prayers*, in which certain leading ideas embedded in the Holy Sacrifice are put into relief and under them are grouped appropriate acts of devotion. These acts are arranged in broken lines, appearing to the eyes as verses, the psychological aim being to arrest the mind, make it travel slowly and brood over the thoughts and affections suggested. The "reasoned prayers" contribute, therefore, more to mental than to oral exercise, and thus keep the soul in touch with the spirit and movement of the sacred drama. And so, "even those who like to limit their prayers to the exact words of the Missal with its daily changes, will find in the memory of the fundamental Mysteries here emphasized a sustaining undercurrent of thought and desire to accompany and swell the meaning of their vocal prayers. For indeed these mysteries and the corresponding cravings of man's heart are the fountain-heads from which the Mass prayers, in the first instance, welled up and took shape and form in words and ritual acts." The little volume will thus contribute greatly to an intelligent employment of the Missal. (New York: Longmans, Green & Co.)

The Dream of the Soldier Saint by Fr. Mullany, S.J., is a vivid portrait of the ideals of St. Ignatius once he had grasped the purpose of life as meaning loyalty to Christ beyond the mere service of an earthly king. Besides being

the story of a portion of the saint's life—that is, up to his founding the Society (1540)—it is an appeal to honesty, courage, and obedience to God's leading. It has a place in the literature of vocation. (Chicago, Loyola University Press.)

In the latter connexion notice may be directed to *Stories from the Field Afar*, reprinted from the organ of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America (Ossining, New York). A second collection of these charming tales has just been issued at a very reasonable price. If young people could be drawn to read these stories, they would find therein a substitute for the sometimes worse than trashy novel—a substitute that would give at once entertainment, instruction, and inspiration.

A laudable movement was inaugurated when "the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History" was organized last September. "The aim of the Association is to raise funds to employ several investigators to collect all historical and sociological material bearing on the Negro, before it is lost to the world." As a medium for preserving some of this material a Quarterly has been founded, the first issue of which appeared in January under the title *The Journal of Negro History*. The editor is Mr. Carter Godwin Woodson, Ph.D. (Harvard), the author of a notable work, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861*. The initial number is a credit to the editor, the contributors, and the publishers. Those who want to know what the negro has done, what he is doing, and what he aims further to do, should consult this publication. It is so well done that many will be moved to coöperate with its efforts. The cost, moreover, of the coöperation is so small that few will be precluded therefrom. (Lancaster, Pa., and Washington, D. C.)

Another quarterly born with the year is *The Immigrants in America Review* (20 West 34th Street, New York). The title is sufficiently descriptive of the scope of this new arrival in the field of periodicals. There is place and need for such a review and, judging by the superior quality of the first issue, the auguries of success are promising.

A novel type of war literature, deviating from the wearisome strains of embittered denunciation, appears in the interesting and sprightly diary of the Abbé E. Duplessy (*Journal apologétique de la Guerre*. Paris, P. Téqui). The author has set himself the task of exploiting the events of the war in the interest of a moral and religious revival of his people. Fearlessly he reminds the government of its anti-religious attitude before the outbreak of hostilities and charges it to undo the wrongs committed against the Church. The book abounds with many anecdotes that illustrate the spiritual awakening of the old France. Even the black cloud of war seems to have a silver lining.

Bloud & Gay publish, in handy pamphlet form, brief and crisp biographies of the men who have been brought to the fore by recent events and whose names are on all lips. Among them we find character sketches of King Albert, General Joffre, General Pau, and others. It goes without saying that the tone of these sketches is laudatory, and that they endeavor to throw into strongest relief the good qualities of their subjects. However, they furnish valuable data for him who wishes to know something about some of the men who engineer the death-dealing conflict of the European nations. (*Pages actuelles*, Paris.)

It requires no great effort of the imagination to realize that the life of a prisoner of war is neither very comfortable nor very pleasant. But nothing short of actual experience can give us a real idea of its hardships and humiliations. Such intimate and realistic glimpses we get from the account of a released prisoner of the Germans, who has published in a small volume what he saw and what happened to him in the country of the enemy (*Prisonnier des Allemands*. Paris, P. Lethielleux). The character of the author, who is a priest of the Society of Foreign Missions, vouches for the truth of the incidents related. There is a gripping pathos in these pages, and on reading, one is tempted to exclaim, O! the pity of it all!

Books Received

SCRIPTURAL.

SAINT PAUL: EPITRE AUX ROMAINS. Par le P. M.-J. Lagrange, des Frères Prêcheurs. (*Études Bibliques.*) J. Gabalda, Paris, 1916. Pp. lxii-395. Prix, 12 *fr.*

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

MYSTERIES OF THE MASS IN REASONED PRAYERS. By Father W. Roche, S.J., author of *The House and Table of God, A Child's Prayers to Jesus.* With a frontispiece. Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York, Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras. 1915. Pp. 96. Price, $0.50 *net.*

L'AUTRE VIE. Par le R. P. Guillermin. (*Aux Ames Blessées.*) P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1915. Pp. 294. Prix, 3 *fr.*; 3 *fr.* 25 *franco.*

LE "DE PROFUNDIS" MÉDITÉ. Par l'abbé Arnaud d'Agnel, Docteur en Théologie et en Philosophie. Pp. 266. Prix, 2 *fr.* 25; 2 *fr.* 50 *franco.*

MISÈRES HUMAINES. Tracts populaires et religieux sur quelques defauts et vices des familles. Par Ed. Hamon. 13e édition avec une Préface du R. P. Lalande. Pierre Téqui, Paris. (McGranger Frères Libraires: Montreal.) 1913. Pp. x-292. Prix, 2 *fr.*

PHILOSOPHICAL.

THE RECONCILIATION OF GOVERNMENT WITH LIBERTY. By John W. Burgess, Ph.D., Ju.D., LL.D., Formerly Professor of Political Science and Constitutional Law, and Dean of the Faculties of Political Science, Philosophy and Pure Science, in Columbia University. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1915. Pp. xix-394. Price, $3.50 *net.*

NEWMAN'S "GENTLEMAN". By Charles L. O'Donnell, C.S.C., Ph.D., Professor of English, University of Notre Dame. Longmans, Green & Co., New York and Chicago. 1916. Pp. 61. Price, $0.35.

SOCIALISM, FEMINISM, AND SUFFRAGISM—The Terrible Triplets, Connected by the Same Umbilical Cord, and Fed from the Same Nursing Bottle. By B. V. Hubbard. American Publishing Co., 1820 City Hall Sq. Bldg., Chicago. 1915. Pp. 301. Price. $1.25.

SOCRATES, MASTER OF LIFE. By William Ellery Leonard. The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago and London. 1915. Pp. vii-118. Price, $1.00.

JUSTICE IN WAR TIME. By Bertrand Russell, author of *German Social Democracy, The Principles of Mathematics*, etc. The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago and London. 1916. Pp. x-243. Price, $1.00.

GRUNDFRAGEN DER PHILOSOPHIE UND PÄDAGOGIK für gebildete Kreise dargestellt. Von Dr. C. Willems, Professor der Philosophie im Priesterseminar zu Trier. I. Band: Das Sinnesleben, pp. 550; II. Band: Das Geistesleben, pp. 560. Trier, 1915: Druck u. Verlag der Paulinus-Druckerei, G.m.b.H.

INSTITUTIONES PHILOSOPHICAE. Auctore C. Willems, S. Theologiae et Philosophiae Doctore, Philosophiae in Seminario Trevirensi Professore. Volumen I: Continens Logicam, Criticam, Ontologiam. Tertio Editio. Treveris, 1915: ex Officina ad S. Paulinum.

LE PROTESTANTISME ALLEMAND. Luther-Kant-Nietzsche. Par J. Paquier, Premier Vicaire de la Sainte-Trinité. Bloud & Gay, Paris. 1915. Pp. 141. Prix, 1 *fr.* 50.

JOURNAL APOLOGÉTIQUE DE LA GUERRE. 1re Série: 1914. Par M. l'Abbé E. Duplessy, du Clergé de Paris, Directeur de la *Réponse.* P. Téqui, Paris. (McGranger Frères Libraires: Montreal.) 1915. Pp. vii-399. Prix, 3 *fr.* 50 *franco.*

HISTORICAL.

THE DREAM OF THE SOLDIER SAINT. By Leo H. Mullany, S.J. Loyola University Press, Chicago. 1915. Pp. 63. Price, $0.10 *postpaid.*

LIFE OF THE REV. CHARLES NERINCKX, Pioneer Missionary of Kentucky and Founder of the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross. By the Rev. W. J. Howlett. Mission Press S. V. D.. Techny, Ill. 1915. Pp. 447.

PRISONNIER DES ALLEMANDS. Par un Prêtre de la Société des Missions Étrangères, infirmier militaire. Deuxième édition. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1915. Pp. vii-170. Prix, 1 *fr.* 50; 1 *fr.* 65 *franco.*

UN CATÉCHISME PANGERMANISTE À L'USAGE DU SOLDAT ALLEMAND. Par Houston Stewart Chamberlain. Traduit par un mobilisé. Avec introduction par M. E. C., Archiviste-Paléographe. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1915. Prix, 0 *fr.* 50; 0 *fr.* 55 *franco.*

WESTDEUTSCHE KRIEGSHEFTE. Herausgegeben vom Verbande kath. Arbeitervereine Westdeutschlands. 1. Wir daheim und Ihr da draussen (64). 2. Deutschland in Weltkreig (74). Die kath. Arbeitervereine Westdeutschlands und der Weltkrieg (36). 4. Schwert und Kreuz (56). 5. Heldentum (50). Verlag der Westdeutschen Arbeiterzeitung G.m.b.H., M. Gladbach. 1915. Preis je 30 Pf.

MÉLANGES D'HISTOIRE RELIGIEUSE. Par le P. M.-J. Lagrange, des Frères Prêcheurs, Correspondant de l'Institut. (*Études palestiniennes et orientales.*) J. Gabalda, Paris. 1915. Pp. 333. Prix, 3 *fr.* 50.

"PAGES ACTUELLES", 1914-1915.

No. 18. *La Signification de la Guerre.* Par H. Bergson, de l'Academie Française et de l'Académie des Sciences morales et politiques. Pp. 47.

No. 20. *Les Sous-Marins et la Guerre actuelle.* Par G. Blanchon, Lieutenant de Vaisseau. Pp. 39.

No. 24. *Les "Zeppelins".* Par Georges Besançon, Secrétaire Général de l'*Aéro-Club de France.* Pp. 45.

No. 28. *Les Surboches.* Par Andre Beaunier. Pp. 47.

No. 38. *À un Neutre Catholique.* Par Mgr. Pierre Batiffol. Pp. 31.

No. 39. *Dans les Tranchées du Front.* Par François Marre, Chroniqueur scientifique du *Correspondant.* Pp. 63.

No. 40. *L'Esprit philosophique de l'Allemagne et la Pensée Française.* Par Victor Delbos, de l'Académie des Sciences morales et politiques. Pp. 43.

No. 46. *Guerre et Philosophie.* Par Maurice DeWulf, Professeur aux Universités de Louvain et de Poitiers. Pp. 47. Bloud & Gay, Paris. Prix, 0 *fr.* 60 par vol.

MISCELLANEOUS.

FIELD AFAR TALES (SECOND VOLUME). Prepared and edited by the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America, Ossining P.O., New York. 1915. Pp. 163.

ADDRESSES AT PATRIOTIC AND CIVIC OCCASIONS. By Catholic Orators. Two volumes. Joseph F. Wagner, New York. Pp. 295 and 312. Price per pair, $3.00 *net.*

OFFIZIELLER BERICHT ÜBER DIE SECHZIGSTE GENERALVERSAMMLUNG DES DEUTSCHEN RÖMISCH-KATHOLISCHEN CENTRAL-VEREINS abgehalten in St. Paul, Minn., am 8, 9, 10, und 11 August 1915. Volksfreund Printing Co., Buffalo, N. Y. Seiten 206.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, Bureau of Weights and Measures, Philadelphia. 2 February, 1915. Pp. vii-59.

CHAFF AND WHEAT. A Few Gentle Flailings. By Francis P. Donnelly, S.J., author of *Mustard Seed,* etc. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1915. Pp. 266. Price, $0.60; postage extra.

MOONDYNE JOE. By John Boyle O'Reilly. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1879. Pp. 315. Price, $0.75.